National Anti-Slavery Standard.

VOL. XXII. NO. 7. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 29, 1861. WHOLE NO. 1,099.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, ON SATURDAY,

AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM,

BY THE

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

At its Office, No. 5 Beekman Street, New York,

AND AT THE OFFICE OF THE

PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

107 *N. Fifth St., above Arch, Philadelphia.*

Letters for publication, or relating in any way to the editorial conduct of the paper, should be addressed, "EDITOR OF THE NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD, NEW YORK."

Letters enclosing subscriptions, or relating in any way to the business affairs of the paper, should be addressed, "PUBLISHER OF THE NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD, NEW YORK."

ADVERTISEMENTS, 10 cents per line each insertion.

Pro-Slavery.

In this Department we give place to such extracts from the Pro-Slavery Press, North and South, as serve best to illustrate the character of Slavery and the spirit of its champions and apologists.

NO ARMY UNDERGROUND RAILROAD.

From The Express.

The Tribune tries to cling to its point, that this war is not an abolition war—as we know it is not, it being only a war for the *very existence of the government*—but, nevertheless, the editor so swings off, and sidles round, that it becomes necessary to watch him and hold on, as children are held on, when first circus riding. No one is disposed to question Gen. Butler's law of "contraband negroes." Everybody sees a negro may be as much contraband as a musket.

"It is no part of the business of the armed defenders of the Union (says *The Tribune*) to catch runaway negroes. (Nor to run them off?—*Express.*) The military have nothing to do with that service except when the execution of the laws is resisted by a formidable force. Still, we think the commanders of the Union forces in loyal portions of the slave States have done right in publicly assuring the deceived and alarmed inhabitants that they shall be protected in all their legal rights, that servile insurrection shall be repressed, and that the escape of their slaves shall not be encouraged. Such assurances have been given to the people of loyal States and communities alone, and in our judgment have been properly given. Their extension to rebel communities in the presence of rebel armies would be quite another matter."

Well! Well! Let us read on:

"But what shall our commanders do with these fugitives? is still asked. We answer, As fugitives, do nothing. Use them so far as they can be made useful, pay them fairly for their services, and then dismiss them to shift for themselves. The fact that some of them may be claimed as chattels by rebels, is no concern of ours. Those rebels may have a plausible claim on Jeff. Davis to catch their fugitive chattels, but they certainly have none on the nation they have abjured, the government they are trying to subvert. Let them catch their own negroes, if they pretend to have any, while we attend simply and solely to putting down the rebellion."

No one proposes to catch Jeff. Davis's negroes. We are only after his white men. But, if General Scott, a Virginian, has negroes and they run away, shall we catch them? Gen. McDowell, the leader of the van before Manassas, is a Virginian, and *he* may have negroes. Shall we run off with them? Commodore Pendergrast, the Commander in the Chesapeake, a Kentuckian, closely connected in Norfolk, Va., which is his home, may have negroes. Shall we run off with them? General Harney, we believe, is a large slaveholder. Shall we run off with his slaves? Thousands of us, upholding the government, shrink from a huge influx of free negroes into the North, as from the invasion of a pestilence. We give them up, not only upon principle, but interest too. We don't want the negro here, bond or free. We look upon negroes, in the North, as a curse upon society, and the fewer of them we have, the better for negroes and white men too. Subordination, we think, is his better, his natural state. Competition for work with the white man we know to be fatal to both. If *The Tribune* means this, well—very well—but if *The Tribune* means, our grand army is to be turned into an Underground Railroad—*a la abolition*—to do the Rev. Capt. Beecher's, or Gerrit Smith's, or Canada Consul Giddings's old jobs, it mistakes the men—especially such musketmen as the Irish 69th or the American 71st—who don't run, and won't run, Underground Railroad locomotives, but who work above board, only to uphold the flag, the government. All of them, no more infected with negro sentiment, or negro sensibilities than my Lord John Russell, or Lord Palmerston, whom *The Tribune* has all along been calculating upon to side with us, because of this "sentiment," would scorn to be negro thieves, negro stealers, Underground Railroad runners, or anything like them. The "negro," the cause of this war, they all wish was in the bottomless pit. Their plan is to *use* negroes during the war as servants, cooks, washermen or women, errand runners, *chore* men, etc.—not to send them North, and to establish them here, as competitors for work, after the war is over, or to share with them their houses, homes, domiciles, in some great dreaming *Tribune* Utopia of Free Niggerdom.

PEACE AND COMPROMISE.

From The Journal of Commerce.

We have evidences daily of a change in public sentiment respecting the policy of the present war, and the probable consequences of its prosecution to the bitter end. The effort to reëstablish Federal authority by force in the seceded States, is, to say the least, of doubtful success. Even such earnest advocates of coercive measures as the Philadelphia *North American*, are compelled to admit that although "we have been for a month and a half preparing for war with an energy never before known, we are still in no condition to prosecute hostilities required by the nature of the occasion."

A leading Republican paper asserts that Maryland is now more strongly for secession than before, and is only held in the Union by force. The subjugation of Virginia is found to be a far more difficult task than was anticipated. Moreover, the fact is beginning to be realized that the most vigorous and protracted war can only end in negotiation and compromise, and the question to be discussed is, whether those terms may not as well be considered now, as after the country is desolated and the contending parties exhausted. We have an abiding faith in the "sober second thought" of the people, and still hope that, by the time Congress meets, public opinion will demand the adoption of some measure that may arrest these unnatural hostilities, or, at least, effect an armistice, to try the experiment of negotiation. This can be done without the sacrifice of principle, or any just power of the government. This is what the Union men of both North and South labored for before, and during the last session of Congress. The effect of its refusal by the Republican party was seen in the immediate withdrawal of several populous and powerful States that might otherwise have been retained. Instead of preserving the Union, a further disintegration was the result. If the efforts for peace that are now being made by State Legislatures and the people, fail of success, then, indeed, we may look forward to the most appalling scenes, and probably they will be of long continuance.

He who advocates peace is the truest friend to the government; and, in the future, it will be seen that a peace policy was the policy that ought to have been adopted in the present crisis, even though the people refuse to recognize it as such now.

JOHN J. CRITTENDEN, speaking lately at Lexington, Kentucky, declared that, in his judgment, every means should be resorted to, to restore the blessings of peace, to preserve the Union, and to hand down unimpaired the noble institutions which have come down to us hallowed by the sanction of our revolutionary fathers. To that end he declared, first, that the Southern States should present to Congress, when it meets, a fair statement of the grievances under which they labor; that, when presented, the Congress of the United States should promptly grant a full measure of redress for those grievances; and that if Congress should not do so, he would not vote one dollar to the prosecution of the war. In the next place, if the South should fail to present their grievances with a view to adjustment, then that the North should promptly concede such assurances of redress and security as were just to the South; and that besides these, all other possible means should be employed that would have the effect of maintaining the Union, preserving the government, and putting a period to the unnatural war in which the country is involved. In the event that all the means employed for this patriotic and noble purpose should fail, and the war should still rage on, then he was of the opinion that Kentucky, poising herself upon her proud position of neutrality, should summon all her judgment and reason, and discarding all passion and prejudice, should decide for herself what position she should assume. He declared that sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof; and that while he was not now, under the continually shifting scenes of the political drama, prepared to say what position Kentucky should occupy in the contingency mentioned, he would be prepared, as a native and loyal son of Kentucky, to follow her destiny, be it what it might.

THE STANDARD.

A LETTER TO THE INDEPENDENT.

To the Editor of The National Anti Slavery Standard.

The enclosed communication was refused by *The Independent* on the ground that its Editors are not under obligation to admit replies to their strictures on published documents. Will you have the kindness to let it go before the public in your columns? H. T. C.

MESSRS. EDITORS: The charge of malignity, denunciation, and "all uncharitableness," has been so often made against Abolitionists, and as often disproved, that it seems hardly worth while now to notice the stale slander. It is more than ever unnecessary since one, of whom it was asked, not many years ago, as in confident challenge, "Is Dr. Tyng an Abolitionist?" has lately declared in public that slavery is a crime that ought to be abolished, and that shall be abolished, by the righteous war in which we are now involved, and that he is neither afraid nor ashamed to be called an Abolitionist.

But when a religious paper, with a circulation of tens of thousands, charges upon a Christian Society, as you have done in *The Independent* of June 6th, that "it systematically misrepresents and maligns in its published documents the Ministry and Churches of New England," the interests of truth demand, on behalf of such a Society, that the charge be met. And no less, in my judgment, does common fairness, not to say the honor of professed Christian gentlemen, require that the reply to such a charge be admitted to your columns.

Relying, therefore, upon your sense of propriety and Christian courtesy to publish what I offer in denial of your charge, I proceed to meet it in the briefest manner compatible with thoroughness, intending to use an honest plainness of speech.

The second Annual Report of the Executive Committee to the Church Anti-Slavery Society—from which you quote with treble notes of exclamation and italic types for a very innocent clause thereof, and with flaunting capitals for the inoffensive conjunction *and*, with which it is joined to the rest of the sentence—was adopted by the Society at its public Business Meeting in Boston, on the day of the late anniversary, May 28th.

This Report, you say, "indicts the Ministry and Churches of New England collectively as faithless to anti-slavery, because unwilling to follow the beck of this particular Society. It says (yours being the italics):

"In the year of grace from MAY 1860, to MAY 1861, when the infamous slave trade was revived and exercised with a fearful activity and prevalence not known before for forty years, and when the country was passing through a political campaign of which, in the providence of God, the only really vital question or living issue was slavery—we have seen the various Ministerial Associations and Conferences of New England meet, pray, confer and indulge in the customary platitudes, but MAKE NO PRONUNCIATION WHATEVER UPON SLAVERY OR THE SLAVE TRADE, nor do anything at all to bring the verdict of Christianity and the Church to bear against either of those foul abominations.

"In Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, the Congregational Ministry met in their annual assemblies, and with the aggressions of slavery and the execrable slave trade in full view, and the Church Anti-Slavery Society knocking at their door, and *asking friendly recognition and concurrence* in its specific work of putting the practice of slaveholding under the opprobrium of Church prohibition, as the Scriptural way of abolishing slavery, they gave not *the faintest token of sympathy* with such a work; nor did they discuss the subject in any way, nor did they propose any method of their own to make the Christianity of the nation effectively felt against the national sin of oppression."

Upon these paragraphs you found the indictment, that "the Church Anti-Slavery Society systematically misrepresents and maligns in its published documents the Ministry and Churches of New England." And the only proof of the count which you offer is in these paragraphs. But your article closes with the following, which many regard as an unbecoming and jesuitical fling:

"For a Society which has knocked at every ecclesiastical door in New England without securing for itself 'friendly recognition' or 'the faintest token of sympathy,' to advise the Churches to give their recognition and fellowship to a Church which a strong anti-slavery council, acting upon documentary evidence, has pronounced delinquent and disorderly, is not less amusing than impertinent."

1. Now, Messrs. Editors, I, in common with others, deliberately call this language jesuitical, and why? Webster defines jesuitical to be designing; cunning; deceitful; prevaricating. The language of yours above quoted (whether by reason of habit you are conscious of it or not I do not say) is designing and cunning, for, in the first place, it artfully insinuates, with an appearance of truth, what is not true, viz.: that, by the Society's own confession, it has knocked at *every* ecclesiastical door in New England, without securing *for itself* friendly recognition, or the faintest token of sympathy.

The Church Anti-Slavery Society has never asked *recognition for itself* in any instance; but it has asked recognition and concurrence in its specific work of trying to put the practice of slaveholding under the opprobrium of Church prohibition, from three different State associations, and from *three only;* and, in each of those three instances, with the same result, not the faintest token of sympathy *with such a work*. We do not say sympathy with the Society itself, but sympathy in its great work of rendering slaveholding infamous in the public eye, by putting it under the ban of excommunication by the Church, as the Scriptural way of abolishing slavery.

2. In the second place, your language is deceitful and prevaricating, for it deceivingly quibbles by an assumption which it uses as a fact, and then cunningly misleads the reader to the conclusion that there can be no moral weight to the advice given to the Churches, by a Society which has been unable to secure for itself any acknowledgment by those Churches, in its honest attempt to array them against slavery, and to procure from them an expression of Christian abhorrence of slaveholding.

It were obvious here to remark that the moral weight of a score of Christian men gathered in the Tremont Temple at Boston, in the Church Anti-Slavery Society, and possessed of "published documentary evidence," is just as great as the moral weight of a score of Christian men gathered in an Ex-Parte Council at the rooms of the Geographical Society in New York, and possessed of the same "published documentary evidence." And the Churches, not less than the community, will be just as likely to give heed to the advice of the one as of the other; only that they will lean, if anything, to the advice that was spontaneous and unsought, rather than to that which was planned and prepared for.

But in another place you are pleased to call this advice "a bit of drollery which is exquisitely refreshing." To whom it is refreshing we are at a loss to know, for to yourselves, evidently, so far from being refreshing, this passage in the late proceedings of the Church Anti-Slavery Society is highly annoying.

3. Your language is jesuitical, again, when you say, quoting the opening paragraph of the Report:

"What an aspersion is this upon the fidelity of the Churches and the Ministry!—what an impertinent assumption, that because they have not seen fit to elect this Society as their representative, therefore they 'have not seen it to be their part to coöperate efficiently with the majestic movements of Divine Providence for the overthrow of slavery.'"

That, Messrs. Editors, is not our reasoning or conclusion, but it is your logic and your inference jesuitically palmed upon us. The Report, which so offends you, simply declares that it is to be deeply regretted that the professed Churches of Christ and the ministry thereof should not have seen it to be their part to coöperate efficiently with the majestic movements of Providence, the last year, toward the overthrow of slavery; and that it is also to be regretted that they should not have furnished the Committee of the Church Anti-Slavery Society with the means to have carried on, in the name of the Church, a more effective moral warfare with slavery.

The Report finds no fault with the Churches or the ministry for the reason that they have not seen fit to elect the Church Anti-Slavery Society as their representative. Nor has this Society ever asked to be so elected. But, in reviewing the past year, the Report truly says, that—

"While your Committee have seen much in the movements of Providence and the imperial march of events, to warrant the belief that the end of slavery is near, even at the doors, they have also seen, in the indifference or hostility to our philanthropic object and method evinced by ministerial bodies, benevolent associations, Churches, and religious newspapers, what has all along put them in grave doubt as to whether there was to be a peaceable or violent solution to the problem of American slavery—whether, in other words, Christianity was to get at the hearts of slaveholders, through the fidelity of Churches and ministers, or whether, as Dr. Guthrie, of Edinburgh, has put it, THE SLAVES WERE TO GET AT THE THROATS OF THEIR MASTERS, and take by force the liberty which they know to be their right."

4. This statement is strictly and undeniably true. For what is the philanthropic object and method of the Church Anti-Slavery Society? It is to put the practice of slaveholding under the opprobrium of Church prohibition, as the Scriptural way of abolishing slavery. In other words, it is to argue and enforce what you have stigmatized as "the almost universally repudiated principle of Church discipline which excommunicates slaveholders." With *this* method of abolishing slavery, by putting slaveholding (through the exclusion of the slaveholder) under the ban of the Churches, "as an immorality, the renunciation of which ought to be made a condition of membership in the Christian Church," none of the General Associations or Conferences of New England Congregationalists have, during the last year, expressed any sympathy.

The nearest approach to it was made by the New Hampshire General Association, at its session in Claremont. But the resolution there adopted carefully avoided the committal of that body to the doctrine of non-fellowship with slaveholders on account of slaveholding, and as carefully avoided the issue made in behalf of the Church Anti-Slavery Society.

5. The soreness repeatedly manifested by *The Independent* towards this Society, and the captious spirit uniformly evinced on your part in speaking of it, are owing, we think, to our having taken and maintained the position that slaveholding of itself should be a bar to church fellowship and communion. This is the ground on which we hold that the Christianity of the nation ought to plant itself. But yourselves and not a few other leading minds of the New England ministry have rejected this as a dogma of uncharitableness, and have accused those who hold it as denunciatory and malignant, and as siding with infidels.

In your late article, entitled "Per Se—Per Saltum," which, it may be presumed, is that especially which has led the Boston *Liberator* to say of *The Independent*, "whose moral basis, in every direction, is a slippery one"—in that article you characterize this view as the "sin-*per-se* dogma, applied by a narrow school of ethics and a most inconsequential style of logic to certain practical questions of morality." And you very self-complacently add that "minds unskilled in logic have declared slaveholding, undefined, to be sin *per se*, making this dogma the text and test of opposition to slavery."

Here, if you mean anything, you mean to say that what you call the sin-*per-se* school in this country (we have never favored that designation, nor have we dealt at all in Latin scholastics) have all along been reasoning about slaveholding without knowing what they meant. "That ambiguous and evasive term slaveholding," you have said before, "makes all the mischief." Now, we deny that the term slaveholding is either ambiguous or evasive, or that we have ever used it in any sense but its true one, or that we have ever attempted to establish any "new anti-slavery tests and definitions."

On the contrary, we assert, with entire confidence, that the ecclesiastical, historical and dictionary meaning of that term slaveholding, together with slave laws and judicial decisions innumerable, and common usage in the English tongue, have long since been agreed in making the term slaveholding to be and to express the holding of human beings as property. And that only is what Abolitionists have meant by it, according to your own virtual confession, in quoting the resolution of the American Anti-Slavery Society in 1845, which declares "that by slaveholding this Society understands the holding and treating of human beings as property, and maintains that to hold and treat a human being thus, is universally and always sinful, and ought to be everywhere immediately abandoned."

This is what the *sin-per-se* school, as you designate it, have invariably meant whenever they have used the term; and it is high time that the religious press in our country should have done with verbal legerdemain, puerile disputation, and hypercritical hair-splitting in regard to it.

6. What if apologists for American slavery of th New York *Observer* type, in the pulpit, the Church the editorial chair, and in the great associations of benevolence, have before now confused facts and confounded moral distinctions by the prefixes applied to slaveholding? What if, when the subject has been brought up by some honest Abolitionist in Synods, Assemblies, Ministers' Meetings, and Boards of Missions, learned brethren have straightway fell to talking about benevolent slaveholding, involuntary slaveholding, legal slaveholding, Christian slaveholding, unselfish slaveholding, innocent slaveholding, and all to shield the slaveholder from having guilt charged home upon him? Yet the fact stands that the real and only meaning of slaveholding, by itself, is the holding of a human being as property, as a thing. That is American slavery; that is what Garrison and Goodell and their eloquent associates have been moving heaven and earth for, the last thirty years; and that is what, in the all-wise providence of God, this country is in arms about now.

And pleased as you might be, Messrs. Editors of *The Independent*, to have "our *per-se* friends come over upon our side by a single hop," and much as it would suit you to "waive all past controversies of logic," it is not going to be waived, that Abolitionists have been all along in the right, and are in the right still, in their principles, their premises, their terms, their logic, their conclusions, their warnings, and their prophesyings.

And we strongly suspect that what has chiefly troubled you in the late Report to the Church Anti-Slavery Society, pumped up by so despicable an agency in your view as "a donkey engine," is the paragraph near the close which says, with a special significance—

"And we have seen, finally, an influential religious paper, at the North, that has rendered valuable service beforetime in the moral war with slavery, and that is now dealing its blows heavy and hot at the dying monster—we have seen that paper, in order to save an assumed principle of its ethics, that slavery is not *malum in se*, and to prevent the moral obloquy of mankind and of the Churches from settling down upon slaveholding, and the slaveholder, reduced to the last shift of maintaining that the term *slaveholding* cannot be held as an invariable equivalent for holding human beings as property, and that, therefore, slaveholding is not inherently sinful."

You, Messrs. Editors, have said a good deal, in your way, in disparagement of the Church Anti-Slavery Society, while its defenders have been almost wholly excluded from your columns hitherto, just as the defenders of the Church of the Puritans have been excluded, while, with all the fury of partisans, you have persistently assailed that Church, and have done your utmost to defeat the honest mission of its pastor in its behalf in Great Britain.

But the time has come when both the Church Anti-Slavery Society and the Church of the Puritans must be heard for themselves in *The Independent*, where they have been misrepresented and maligned, or the Ministry and the Churches will be apprized of the gross unfairness of your proceedings. To me it is anything but pleasant to say these things. But when, with what many call flippant arrogance, you indict as malignant and impertinent the "published documents of the Church Anti-Slavery Society," which bear the honored Christian names of Hon. I. Washburn, of Worcester, Hon. Wm. Claflin, of Newton, Rev. J. C. Webster, of Hopkinton, and Lewis Tappan, of New York, it is not for a Christian minister in my humble position to keep silent.

I am well aware that I expose myself to your sore displeasure, and to your favorite way of manifesting that displeasure by ridicule and scorn. But sneering and slander have little of terror to one conscious of rectitude, and impelled by duty. While I make no professions of stronger love for justice or firmer devotion to principle than other honorable men, yet this I know: let me see or hear a wrong done to any man, and it awakens at once an outcry of indignation in my own soul. Nor can I tamely submit to wrong treatment in the case of a neighbor, or in my own case, without an indignant protest. The wrong itself I can sustain

"With temper, look to heaven, nor stoop
To think my injurer my foe."

But to oppose oppression is a part of my religion. Nor can I help resisting tyranny and domineering in Church or State, in a clique of ministers and editors, a committee of trustees, or an Ex-Parte Council, without doing violence or treachery to my own moral nature. In so acting I know no fear of man, while I boast no courage.

But I should be untrue to the revered maternal example and lessons of youth and manhood, did I not detest injustice in every shape. For this it is that the poor man and the slave—the one often, the other always the victims of injustice—have my warmest sympathies and prayers. For this it is that I am an Abolitionist, and that I have always declared myself such, and have stood by that worthy name when it was purposely used in opprobrium, as a synonym for fanaticism and infidelity.

For this it is that, without asking how it will affect *my* interests, when I see a desperate effort made to put down a man, a Church, or a Society, I spring to the defence, and I am ready to answer those that meet me as Fluidius Triscus, a Senator of Rome, answered the Emperor Vespasian, when he threatened him with death if he spake anything in the Senate but what he, the Emperor, would have him speak—"Do what *you will*, and I will do WHAT I OUGHT."

Alas, that at this solemn season, under the manifest judgment of the Most High God for our great national sin of oppression, there should not be evinced by editors, ministers, and Churches, a clearer knowledge of the time of our visitation! Alas, that we should not all be taking occasion as one man, from our papers, our pulpits, and our prayer-meetings, quitting all our past antagonisms, to press home upon the suffering Nation its guilt in the matter of slaveholding, and to urge now, by the authority of God, upon the people and the Government—not the wretched pretence "that we have no right directly to interfere with the institution of slavery"—but the peremptory duty of the immediate national abolition of the nuisance of slaveholding, and the proclamation of LIBERTY THROUGHOUT ALL THE LAND UNTO ALL THE INHABITANTS THEREOF, in the name of the people of the United States, and by command of the only living and true God.

Unless we do this very soon, I greatly fear that the angle of Divine forbearance will have been rounded by us, and that the decree will go forth, not then to be arrested from execution by "*many prayers*" from an apostate and rotten Church: ACTUM EST DE TE—TU PERIISTI—It is all over with thee—thou hast perished. HENRY T. CHEEVER.

Jewett City, Ct., June 11, 1861.

Selections.

THE CHURCH AND THE CRISIS.

From The Cincinnati Free Nation.

THEY who have waited and watched, and longed for the time when the utterances of the Church upon the great sin of this land should be clear and bold and manly, cannot but be grieved at the little influence which it is exerting upon public sentiment, when, beyond all other times in the history of the country, the whole power of Christian instruction and rebuke is needed. How small a share the Church will be able to claim in this great deliverance, when its hour shall come!

It is in the power of the Evangelical Churches of this land to render certain now the emancipation of slaves by the best possible method which Christian benevolence can devise. Under God, the Churches, by a firm, decided, yet kind tone, could originate and guide a movement which should free our land from its sin and curse, and secure for us peace and prosperity in the future. Many Churches, ministers, and ecclesiastical bodies have, we know, taken a right position, and are exerting their proper influence, and yet the cowardly, truckling spirit, the miserable shifts resorted to to evade the responsibility, the cold, short-sighted policy exhibited by large ecclesiastical bodies and by many minsters and Churches, is not only painful but disgusting.

The question why the Evangelical Churches have maintained no firmer hold upon the popular heart is surely answered in part, by such action as that of the O. S. General Assembly, which could spend so much time in hot debate over a resolution like that offered by Dr. Spring, simply proposing that the Church should give its moral support to the government in its struggle with treason, and could only be passed by depriving it of its point and value, by making it so general as not necessarily to mean support for the present administration. When the popular heart is throbbing through all the North with loyalty to the present government, with its approbation of its action, a Church that will coldly fold its arms, and case its heart in selfish policy, and place the unity of its organization above the safety and integrity of the Union, and which remains silent as the stones of the street upon the one cause of rebellion and war, such a Church has no reason to hope for any sympathy from the masses, and no right to complain if it is deserted and scorned by the people. Such a Church is practically a society for the promotion of infidelity.

The lack of Christian manliness which is so often exhibited by Churches and ministers of the North in dealing with slavery, is one of the most painful and disheartening features of the times. Especially is it so to those who cling to the Church as the divinely appointed agent for the reformation of society, and who long to see her stand forth and vindicate her claims to this noble mission.

It is most grievous to see ministers, who claim that they are strongly opposed to slavery, inventing all sorts of excuses for silence in such an hour as this, who are excited with fear or dislike at the least mention of emancipation for the slave, who perhaps are willing to talk bravely against rebellion, but have not one word to say about the *cause* of the conspiracy, and who are for the Constitution and government as it is, and was; the slave still bound, the sin unrepented of, the curse still upon us, the North still dishonored, and the anger of the Lord not turned away. Some think it highly ministerial and judicious to be absolutely neutral and silent, when the government which has shielded them and their families, under whose protection the Churches assemble to worship in peace Sabbath by Sabbath, is struggling for its life and honor. Others wish to exclude the mention and the very thoughts of slavery *as a sin*, by throwing a blind over the whole subject, and treating it only as a question whether the *institution* shall be local or national. Others still, desirous of bearing some testimony against slavery, feel bound to speak gently, with "bated breath," as in the presence of a master, and seek out circumlocutions and paraphrases, and words which, by *implication*, may mean slavery; and thus public documents which go forth as the expression of carefully weighed opinions, are made pointless and worthless, or rather serve to conceal whatever real anti-slavery feeling there may be in the bodies where they originate.

All this is in such marked contrast with the bold, clear, manly, though wrong utterances of Southern ministers, that we cannot but blush at the comparison.

They use no ambiguous phrases, they shrink from no fair issue, they speak with firmness and decision, and hence their power over the popular mind.

When will Northern ministers speak with equal boldness for the right? Why should the spell of the Slave Power deprive us any longer of the power of manly utterance? We are not called upon to be of a revengeful or denunciatory spirit, but if ministers of the North wish to exert any influence upon public thought, if they would preserve the respect of the people, they must no longer turn pale and tremble, and seek out soft, conciliatory words in the presence of slavery. The people and even the government are in advance of those who ought to be teachers and leaders.

INDIAN COUNCIL—SECESSION.

From The Lawrence (Kansas) Republican, June 13.

YESTERDAY, we met on the streets of Lawrence, Black Beaver, a Delaware Indian, who, for several years, has lived amongst the Choctaws. He says he was driven off because he was a "Yankee Indian." He started about the time the United States troops left Fort Smith, and was advised by some of the military officers to go. In the language of the Indian, "Bad white man and fool red man talk about seceding and raise Texas flag, and swear he scalp Yankee Indian." He had about four hundred head of cattle, that he was trying to gather up preparatory to leaving, when the commandant at the fort told him, "Let the cattle go to h—l and save your scalp," and he thought Indian better do it. Some told him he would be killed, but he was determined to go back.

We are informed by Mr. Abbott, the agent of the Shawnees, and Mr. Ross, of the Potowatomies, that both these tribes have sent deputations to a Council. The Delaware deputation, consisting of Tonganoxie, John Sarcoxie, Black Beaver, Washington and Brown, were on their way. The Council meets at Burnt Timbers, on Canadian River. Black Beaver says the Choctaws and Chickasaws have seceded, while the Cherokees, Creeks and Seminoles are for the Union. Ross, the Chief of the Cherokees, was the principal man in getting up the Council. While we have no doubt Ross is a Union man, we presume large bodies of the wilder portion of his people are with the Secessionists. We think that a "speck of war" is brewing amongst the red men.

FORESHADOWINGS OF COMPROMISE.

Correspondence of The World.

WASHINGTON, June 21.

FOR some days past, ill-omened rumors have flitted through the semi-official circles of this city, which have found their echo in the editorials of *The World* and its contemporaries—rumors that affected the public variously, and which gave promise to breed trouble in the Cabinet, trouble in the camp, trouble in the city, and trouble everywhere. Mysterious whisperings concerning great events yet shadowed by coming time have made all men shudder, from the President in his office, to the greasiest mechanic in Massachusetts. We have heard that the Secretary of State was cunningly devising a plan of compromise by which the present inharmony might ride into place and power; but we could not credit it. In fact, we heard such stories concerning men in whose integrity we had hitherto trusted, and in whose firm, unyielding patriotism we placed reliance, as to make us shrink from the next comer, lest he should bring word of treason, and perhaps worse, dishonor.

We have fully appreciated the anxiety of the country to know if such things could really be, and it was because we respected so thoroughly the integrity of our government that we have declined thus far to send on the rumors. I am enabled, however, to-day to give you, somewhat in detail, the facts concerning one of the most remarkable, and yet most natural events of the age. I do not send them unadvisedly, but only after patient investigation and mature consideration. The source of my information cannot be made public; it is sent privately for the satisfaction of the editors of *The World;* but the people may rest assured that the truth is the corner-stone of this dispatch.

I well know that the readers of *The World* will believe that the rebels are frightened, and that they are most anxious to make terms with the parent government, and I am fully prepared for their astonishment when they read that their commissioners are in Washington.

It seems that Jefferson Davis, having become thoroughly frightened, has, in a semi-official manner, made overtures to our government. When his commissioners reached the capital they were desired to state their case, and to tell what they wished. They submitted two propositions:

1. That the United States unconditionally recognize the existence of the Southern Confederacy, and that the latter be permitted for a term of one, two, or three years, to carry on their government as an experiment. That the expenses of the war, thus far incurred, be equitably arranged between the two sections, and that each do its best for the maintenance of friendly feeling and intercourse between the two peoples. And that if, at the expiration of the time agreed upon, it be found that the experiment cannot succeed, a commission be appointed to reconstruct a union.

This proposition was peremptorily rejected. Whereupon they modestly put forth another, as follows:

2. The South will be content if the government will pledge itself to pass, at the coming session of Congress, an irrepealable constitutional provision, recognizing and legalizing forever the institution of slavery below 36 deg. 30 min., which is the southern boundary line of the State of Missouri. This done, the Southern Provisional government pledges itself instantly to abandon the war, and to reëstablish peace and the most cordial relationship, so far as its section is concerned; to redirect the course of trade into its accustomed channels, and in every way restore the happy days of our forefathers.

As to the reception which this proposition received, my informant was positive, though from another source I gather a doubt. He states that it, also, was peremptorily rejected. It seemed to the party of the second part a mere intensification of the Crittenden amendment, and not varying greatly from the Adams proposition. Others say that the acceptance of this proposition would not be unacceptable to the Secretary of State; and, therefore, will meet with favor from the President. Between the two I cannot decide.

Mr. Davis says that his retreat from Harper's Ferry was a stroke of peaceful policy. He had troops enough there to withstand any force which Gen. Scott was prepared to bring against him, and it was not because he feared the result of an engagement at that time, but because he knew that he had no force with which to meet what might subsequently be sent against him. The secession government now rests on a hope; that hope once swallowed up in a disastrous defeat upon the battle-field, would prove the destruction of what it now sustains. He is sensible of the fact, that if once defeated, there would rise such a tide of popular indignation against him and his coworkers that they could in no way withstand, and ignominious flight or ignominious death would be the lot of one and all.

Correspondence of The Tribune.

WASHINGTON, June 17, 1861.

There are harbingers of peace impending with the coming Fourth of July. Dr. Crittenden, of the Kentucky College of Pharmacy and Practice, is to be at the Capital with saddle-bags and surgery, to heal the chronic disorder of the patient by the most approved remedies of the old school of Therapeutics. The visit is too late. Alteratives and aperients have failed of their virtues. We have had flax-seed poultices and soothing lotions, but inflammation has gone on to suppuration. Dr. Crittenden can spare his soporifics and sudorifics. His sweet oil can be saved to mitigate the crudities of his salad, and the attendant feather may be made of service to tickle the sensitive localities of the constituency who are to send him to Congress with a faded olive-branch in his hand. Its unction and its lubrication will be thrown away on the pinions and journals of the mechanism which he is ambitious to set again smoothly running.

If Congress are to be brought together in the hot, high sun of July, to go over again the old and poor farce of duping and dragging the North into a new complicity with slavery, under the specious appearances of a truce, it is well that we understand the character of the drama and the cast of the *dramatis personæ*. Mr. Crittenden need not fear a thin house when the performance is to come off. Pit, box and gallery will be filled by a spectatorship who are making it now a special and peculiar business to compromise this question upon a new theory of adjustment. Bell-crowned hats and round-toed boots are just now out of fashion, and discreet men leave them in their wardrobes and buy a new outfit according to the mode. The practice is worthy of the imitation of the modern peace-maker. Five hundred thousand earnest men in arms, every one of whom buckled on his knapsack because he saw there was work to do, are not likely to go home without some practical solution of the difficulties which they have not sought to adjust in this way until after all other resources had failed in their trial. Congress may do what they will, but the mightier power which is behind Congress and all other constituted authority will submit to nothing which looks to a restoration of peace without the guaranties of submission for the future, and indemnity for the past. The same men who have touched ballots for a quarter of a century can handle a cartridge with equal dexterity of finger.

From The New York Times.

The Administration will have many friends in the approaching Congress. If party lines are to be thought of at all at such a time, the Republicans will be overwhelmingly in the majority; but when the existence of the government and the integrity of the national territory are at stake, there can be but one line of division between parties, viz.: that which separates the friends from the enemies of the country. There may be a few men in each House whose hearts are not thoroughly in sympathy with the efforts of the people to suppress rebellion, and it will be the duty of the people and of the press to watch their motions. Whoever is not in favor of prosecuting the war until the traitors are overthrown—whoever begins to talk about offering terms of compromise, or of suspending hostilities until the rebels ground their arms—may be set down as a sympathizer with the enemy.

When the right of secession was a matter of speculation merely, it is but charitable to admit that the friends of the heresy might be faithful in their allegiance to the country; but now that its recognition as a fact comes up for action, and the honor of the nation is staked upon its suppression, it is safe to say that no man who favors it, whether he be Northern or Southern, can be a patriot; and the integrity and fidelity of Congressmen or others who propose or advocate the right of States to secede, should at once be suspected. Of course, no man of honor whose sympathies are with the rebels can for a moment think of swearing to support the Constitution; and the people will have little more confidence in those who, after taking the official oath, go to work to defeat the measures of government for the overthrow of the traitors. A man cannot serve two masters or two countries, and he who sympathizes with rebellion cannot be trusted to guard the ramparts of the Constitution.

The country has great respect for the character of Mr. Crittenden, of Kentucky, but the position he has taken of a divided allegiance, with the preponderating half on the side of the State, will render him anything but a safe counsellor, and it would be a great deal better for the cause of the Union, the Constitution and the enforcement of the laws, that an avowed Secessionist should be elected to Congress from his district, than the venerable, respectable and once patriotic Senator. An avowed Secessionist could do no harm. He would at once be sent to Coventry, if not to jail, but the return of the Nestor of the Senate, with his "compromises" and his halting allegiance, will be a formidable aider and abettor of treason, whatever his purposes may be.

GEN. BUTLER AND THE "CONTRABANDS."

THE decision of General Butler, which has been ratified by the government, that negro slaves in the hands of the Secessionists are contraband of war, and therefore subject to seizure, will bear the closest scrutiny and should be acted upon to the letter. If the government should seize upon ammunition, or any ordinary munitions of war in the possession of the enemy, no one can doubt that they would be confiscated and used without ceremony. And if prisoners are taken, they are held, and their utility as soldiers in the rebel ranks will be destroyed. If they desert to the side of the government, they will at once be taken into service, and their arms turned against the enemy who equipped them. We should laugh at a proposition to return them "on demand" to those who claim them. Then why should there be a scruple as to the disposition to be made of negroes who run away from their rebel owners and seek shelter in our camps, or even of those who may be captured in the rebel service? For, whether they be in the rebel military service, employed in digging intrenchments, or in their fields planting, plowing or gathering grain to feed their troops, they are, in either case, giving aid and comfort to the enemy. The rebel armies cannot go to war unless the slaves remain faithful at home, and the latter are as essential to the success of the campaign as the former. If they were free citizens who remained at home from choice, and who sold the products of their labor to the enemies of the government from necessity, we might excuse them the peculiarity of their position. But, being slaves, they labor for nothing in the cause of rebellion, and thus enable their masters to go to the wars.

Slavery renders a country weak and indefensible in war only when the enemy avails itself of the disaffection of the slaves. If the armies of the invader are to be employed in capturing fugitives to be returned to their owners, and in suppressing the uprisings of the slaves, the institution, instead of being dangerous, becomes a source of strength. The effect of such a policy is to give assurance to the rebels that the Federal government will protect them from loss and danger by the desertion or insurrection of their menials, while they are overthrowing the Constitution and setting up another system of government in its place. Nothing could be more absurd than such a course, and if the Administration pursues it, it can be in no hurry to put an end to the war.

There should not be the least scruple about liberating all slaves of the Secessionists that may fall into the hands of the government, and they should at once be allowed to seek their fortunes by emigration, whenever they cease to be useful in working in the trenches; and, under no circumstances, should they be restored to their owners, who will at once make them efficient allies, directly or indirectly, in fighting their battles.—*Washington Cor. Times.*

WHAT THE WAR SHOULD BE.

From The Ashtabula (Ohio) Sentinel.

Is it possible that our rulers have not yet learned wisdom? Is it possible they have not yet learned that slavery is

nant and overwhelming army that will soon be upon them (applause). We have patiently borne the insolence and the tyranny of the Southern monarchists for more than a generation. The American people will bear it no longer (great applause). Observe that when a Scotchman, or an Irishman, or a German comes to the United States, he merges his own nationality into the country that adopts him as a son; and so, when this revolt is suppressed, and this war is ended, our beneficent government will no longer be perplexed by doubtful questions. There will then be no more talk of Virginians, Marylanders, Pennsylvanians, or Mississippians. No, gentlemen, thank God! we shall then be all Americans (great applause). Then there will be no fealty but that to the Union and the Constitution of the United States; no miserable casuistry about the doctrine of State Rights, and no attempt to incorporate the heresy of secession into our system. I will say nothing of the Administration beyond this: that as was said a moment ago, it has at its head a President as honest and upright a man as ever lived; and *I believe that this war will not end with his consent until there will be no cause left for war* (applause).

Talk about the weakness of this government after all these manifestations of the spirit of the people! Why, it is the strongest government, to-day, in the world. It is the government of the people. Every man is here a sovereign, and every man is acting in defence of his own rights, while obedient to the great bond which unites us in a common brotherhood, and makes every inch of American soil sacred to the whole people. This army which has been gathered, represents such people; and when Congress meets I am confident they will gladly ratify everything that has been done by the President and the Cabinet, under the extraordinary emergencies in which they have found themselves (applause). On the other hand, the government of the monarchists of the South ignores the people and is already seeking for examples among the despotisms of the Old World to conduct and complete its experiment of demoralization. They have no sympathy with the industrious and laboring masses of our people. They live by the sweat of other men's brows—the sinews and muscles of other men feed them, and their misfortune is that they have done nothing but govern. Here, in the Grand Army of the Republic, you find the tailor and the lawyer, the merchant, the clergyman and the professor; all classes and trades mingle together, and are moved by the same influence, and resolved to protect and preserve the country which protects and preserves them. Such a people cannot only not be conquered, but will always conquer when they resolve to do so.

WARNINGS.

Correspondence of The Tribune.

WASHINGTON, June 22, 1861.

SHALL I tell you, frankly and honestly, what I hear around me and abroad? It is, that there is no intention to press this suppression of rebellion—that the patience of the people is to be worn out by delay—that the soldier is to have his spirit wasted in the torpor and inaction of camp; and when, at length, the nation are disgusted and outraged to a proper point, then we are to run after the old harlot of a compromise. Mr. Crittenden, or some other senile legacy of a past generation, who has not had sufficient respect for public opinion to die at the proper time, is to stupefy the pride of the North with the anæthesia which deadens to shame and drives to ignoble concession. I express no opinion as to the truth of such suspicions, but I may say to those who are in power, and are our appointed leaders, that it were better that the vows of office had never passed their lips before they venture on such an experiment. You could not stand one hour before the sweeping wrath of the soldier and citizen. The lines which divide treason from fidelity are slight and almost imperceptible, but when once discerned, the indignation which brings armed States here, to put down a rebellion in the South, will stay here to purge the threshing-floor if there is flagging, or failure, or recreancy to the great duties of the trial. Weakness may be even worse than crime. Delay of action becomes guilt. Temporizing when there should be quick execution is as bad as the treason which waits to go over to the enemy. This is plain talk, but you had better hear it from me than from a file of mailed men in the hot blood of anger. You had better heed the warning of the people in the small voice than to hear the summoning blast of the ram's horn.

The Tribune, alluding to the statement of its correspondent, says: "If the war is to be dragged along until the people, weary of armies without action, and taxes without triumphs, *can be brought to consent to some compromise like that of Mr. Crittenden*—if this purpose, or anything approaching it, is really entertained by the Cabinet, or by any members of it, we warn those gentlemen that they cannot much longer remain in the service of the United States. Indeed, they might as well begin to pack their trunks now."

TWO PLENIPOTENTIARIES.

From The Tribune, June 25.

WE learn, from sources in which we place perfect confidence, that the Hon. R. M. T. Hunter, of Virginia, and the Hon. James A. Bayard, of Delaware, have both been in this city within the past ten days, on a mission to the Hon. Fernando Wood and the leaders of the Democratic party, and to various magnates of the financial world in Wall street. Indeed, for aught we know, they are still here. It is almost unnecessary that we should add that their mission is a secret one, and that both these distinguished gentlemen have conducted their negotiations with all possible privacy. In fact, from prudent regard to their personal convenience, they were both disguised, and went about their business under the cover of darkness, and in the secrecy of close coaches and back parlors.

This business was nothing else than to arrange the terms of a new compromise for satisfying the rebels and settling the rebellion, to be presented to Congress at its session next month. How far the Plenipotentiaries were furnished with evidence of their authority to speak in the name of Jeff. Davis, we do not pretend to know; but that they did assume to speak in his name there is not the least reason to doubt. The propositions made by them in behalf of Davis & Co.—in which firm Hunter is a full partner and Bayard a sleeping partner only—were as follows:

1. That the independence of the seceding States be admitted and recognized; or else,

2. That the United States give a perfect constitutional guarantee for the maintenance and perpetuation of slavery in all the present and future Territories south of the parallel of 36 deg., 30 min., north latitude; that a complete amnesty for every offence connected with the rebellion be agreed upon, with a guarantee to every former citizen of all rights of citizenship, including the right to hold office (it is evident that Hunter still hopes to be President), and to every military and naval officer of his appropriate rank in the service. On the basis of these guarantees Messrs. Hunter and Bayard say that the insurgent States will lay down their arms and return into the Union. They would much prefer separation and independence, but they will put up with this compromise.

Under the inspiration of these eminent statesmen, a petition has already been prepared and secretly circulated for signatures, praying Congress to make peace on these terms; the gentleman who gives us this information estimates that when it was offered to him for signature it already bore more than a thousand names. He kicked the bearer of it out of his place of business. We know also of one leading banker in Wall street who refused to meet the plenipotentiaries, and even declined to be told who they were.

—In bringing these facts to the knowledge of the public, we say frankly that we have no fear that terms so fatal and degrading will ever be adopted by the American people, and for the following reasons:

1. The American people are not so foolish or so weak as to submit to the Mexican system of reversing by rebellion the decision of a regular legal election. If the Insurgent States want new guarantees for slavery, let them begin by disbanding their armies, arresting their leading traitors, and leaving them for trial, and returning to full obedience to the Constitution and the laws of the Union. Then let them seek the new guarantees which they desire, by an appeal to public opinion, and through the ballot-box. And we warn them that the longer they continue in their present attitude, the less likely will they be to meet with attention in their subsequent peaceful appeal for the guarantees they so long for. This war does not tend to make people more in love with slavery, but the contrary.

2. The American people, being thoroughly in earnest, mean that Secession shall not be bought off, but that it shall be suppressed, so thoroughly that it will never again be heard of.

3. The American people are not so anxious about a speedy termination of the war, though they are by no means indifferent on that subject, as they are that, when the business is once settled, it shall be settled forever. They do not mean to leave any loophole open through which their children or grandchildren will again be exposed to the enormous losses and the bitter sufferings which this atrocious and causeless rebellion has now produced. To this end, in their judgment, negotiation is now out of place, and an immediate advance on Richmond is the only fit answer to these propositions.

4. Finally, however willing Messrs. Hunter, Davis, Bayard & Co., may be to get out of the dangers that now beset their path as traitors against the mildest and most beneficent government in the world, it does not follow that the chivalry of South Carolina, Alabama and Georgia, will be so zealous in the same cause. They mean to fight; to flog the Yankees is their indomitable purpose. They are not yet alarmed as Davis and Hunter are; and till they have learned the lesson of defeat and humiliation, they will not be ready for peace, no matter what compromise you propose.

—We dare say that some of these statements will be disputed; but we repeat that we have them from authority which with us is conclusive; that they are confirmed from various quarters; and that no denial which can come from the rebel camp can be received as evidence against them.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

WITHOUT CONCEALMENT—WITHOUT COMPROMISE.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 29, 1861.

CORRESPONDENTS will greatly oblige us by a careful observance of the following directions, viz.:

Letters enclosing matter for publication, or relating in any way to the editorial conduct of the paper, should be addressed, "EDITOR OF THE ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD, No. 5 BEEKMAN STREET, NEW YORK."

Letters enclosing subscriptions, or relating in any way to the business of the office, should be addressed, "PUBLISHER OF THE ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD, No. 5 BEEKMAN STREET, NEW YORK."

ANTI-SLAVERY CELEBRATION OF THE FOURTH OF JULY.

THE usual Anti-Slavery Celebration of Independence Day, in mass meeting, will be held in the beautiful and commodious Grove at FRAMINGHAM, on THURSDAY, July 4th, under the direction of the Managers of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society. Hitherto, it has never failed to secure a multitudinous gathering of the truest friends of universal liberty, from various parts of the Commonwealth; and the circumstances of the times are such as to warrant the expectation, that the number will be largely augmented at the approaching anniversary.

A most cordial invitation to be present is extended to all who love freedom for those who are unjustly deprived of it, as well as for themselves; who desire to witness the immediate and utter overthrow of that hideous slave system which has so long consigned to hopeless servitude millions of unoffending men, women and children, and out of which all our national divisions and troubles proceed, as deadly waters from a poisoned fountain; and whose hope is to see in the star spangled banner, ere the present civil conflict terminate, the symbol of unconditional emancipation from ocean to ocean.

Among the speakers who are expected to address the assembly are Wendell Phillips, Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Edmund Quincy, T. W. Higginson, Rev. James Freeman Clarke, H. C. Wright, Samuel May, Jr., A. T. Foss, E. H. Heywood, Rev. J. Sella Martin, and others.

There will be no lack of able and eloquent speakers on the occasion.

WM. LLOYD GARRISON,
SAMUEL MAY, JR.,
HENRY O. STONE,
CHARLES A. HOVEY,
E. H. HEYWOOD,
GEORGE W. STACY,
Committee of Arrangements.

REMOVAL.

THE Philadelphia Anti-Slavery Office has been removed from 107 North-Fifth Street to 109 North-Tenth Street—four doors above Arch, west side, nearly opposite the office of *The Friends' Review*.

All business pertaining to the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society, including the sale of anti-slavery books, the receipt of subscriptions for THE STANDARD, *Liberator*, London *Anti-Slavery Advocate*, etc., etc., will be transacted as heretofore at this office.

J. M. MCKIM, Cor. Sec'y.

OUR PLAN AND OUR LANGUAGE.

OUR long-tried and admirable friend and fellow-laborer, Mrs. Harriet Martineau, in her letter of June the 3d, asks us, on behalf of our best friends in England, to say what is the aim of the North in the present struggle. This is really a very hard question to answer, inasmuch as the North is a very comprehensive term, including millions of people of every variety of opinion, who, though all but unanimously on the side of the government in this war, are so with very different views and wishes as to the final results to grow out of it. Some, undoubtedly, would be satisfied with a restoration of the *status quo ante bellum*; provided, the possibility of another disturbance of the kind should be effectually hindered, and the old course of trade with the South, the return of fugitive slaves included, could be put upon its old footing. Others would not be satisfied without material guarantees against the outrages of slavery on Northern men within its own jurisdiction and against its controlling influence at Washington: While a rapidly increasing class see clearly that there can be no permanent peace with the South while slavery is permitted to exist, and would rest satisfied with nothing short of Emancipation as the condition of Reunion—wanting which, they would prefer that the slave States should be left to try their experiment of republican institutions with slavery for the head of the corner, by themselves, after the nation had proved itself to be a nation by vindicating, through its military successes, the power of dictating the terms of the separation.

But if the inquiry be limited to the intentions and purposes of the General government in the present struggle, the answer is not far to seek. The aim of the government at Washington is that of all governments when attacked by rebels, its own preservation and the discomfiture of the insurgents. Its object is none other than that of the British government in suppressing the Fifteen and the Forty-five in the last century, and the rebellions in Canada, in Ireland and in India, in this. A minority of the nation, making a pretext of a strictly legal and constitutional act of the majority, shake off their allegiance, declare their independence, seize upon the strongholds and property of the nation, and commit a flagrant act of war. The government, after a period of patience and long-suffering unprecedented in the history of the world, proceeds to rally the loyal part of the nation and to put down the rebellion by the strong hand. What else could it do and remain a government? It had pushed patience to the very verge of pusillanimity, and it is not to be wondered at that lookers-on in Europe should doubt whether it had spirit and strength sufficient for its day. But no one on this side who witnessed the magnificent spectacle of a people strong enough to be patient, arising in its might when patience had ceased to be a virtue or a possibility, can doubt the energy and the resources of the North. In less than two months from the first act of war, a people of the most pacific habits and pursuits have put an army of 225,000 men into the field, according to returns from the War Department, while thousands more are sent forward every week. The enthusiasm of the first week after the bombardment of Fort Sumter was scarcely more sublime than the calm and business-like energy with which regiment after regiment is raised, equipped and dispatched, as if fighting had been the single occupation of the people all their lives. Whatever else this war may prove, there can never more be a question that the United States is to be a great nation, strong at home and formidable abroad. This we have always bragged of being; but this it was impossible for us to be, or to know that we were, as long as slavery was the Lord of our Ascendant.

President Lincoln and his Cabinet, then, propose to themselves the suppression of this rebellion and the vindication of the integrity of the United States government. Of course, their object is to maintain the Constitution of the United States which they have sworn to support. It could not be their purpose to put down slavery, primarily. If a possible thing, their intention was and doubtless still is, to subdue the insurrection, to punish the traitors and to reëstablish the state of affairs before the war. Whether, as the war goes on, it will be found possible to preserve the government without destroying the incidental institution of slavery, whose essential nature is to enlarge itself into the sole institution of the Constitution, remains to be seen. The war will be a school in which the nation will learn many things to which it has all along resolutely shut its eyes. It is perfectly true, as Mrs. Martineau says, that "the government at Washington follows, instead of leading, the National Will." This has been shown by the history of the last two months. The President has advanced just as fast as he has been pressed forward by the people behind him. He disclaimed all intention of invading or subduing the seceding States, farther than was necessary to repossess himself of the places and property of the government seized by them. But now he finds his army pushing forward into Virginia, without any very particular limitation to these specific objects. He began by calling for 75,000 volunteers for three months, a thing within his constitutional powers to do. He ends by enrolling an army for the war which will not fall far short of 300,000 men by the time Congress meets on the Fourth of next July. Here he probably exceeds his powers; but everybody applauds him for doing it, and he will be fully sustained in it. He began by the most unequivocal protestations of fidelity to the Fugitive Slave law and to the protection of slave property. He ends by accepting Gen. Butler's ingenious legal definition whereby fugitive slaves are declared to be Contraband of War, as entrenching tools, and sustaining him in it. In all this he has the support of the entire North, and he will be strong or weak in the exact proportion of the strength or weakness of the nation which holds him up.

This being the case, it is of course impossible at this early stage of affairs, that "the aim of the uprisen nation should be clear, definite and express"—for there is no way of getting at such definition and expression. The whole North are aware, with Mrs. Martineau and our English friends, that it is "resisting aggression, defending liberties, upholding the Republic"; and that strikes us as clear and definite enough for a beginning. Many of the Northern people, including multitudes who would resent the name of Abolitionists, believe with them also "that the abolition of slavery is pretty sure to be the consequence." We think that the war rests, as far as the North is concerned, on a sufficiently clear and distinct basis. What we have to fear is the attempts to reduce its objects down to some single insufficient, unsatisfying point, excluding everything that is enlarged and generous in its possibilities. This attempt will, undoubtedly, be made in Congress next month, we trust without success, by the open and secret friends of the Slave Power. We well remember the late lamented Dr. Follen used to say when asked, "What is the Plan of the Abolitionists?"—that the strength and virtue of their movement lay in their having *no* Plan. It was elastic and would adapt itself to the circumstances as they arose, and as soon as the purpose of emancipation was a settled one, the Plan would provide itself fast enough. So it is as to this War. The North and the South are divided into two opposing armies, on the quarrel of slavery. Everybody knows that slavery is the only occasion of the controversy, although a few try to wrap it up in circumlocutions. It strikes us that this is a very satisfactory condition of things, as far as the enemies of slavery are concerned. For, either the armies of the United States will be completely victorious and march triumphantly over the rebellious States, reasserting its power by force of arms, in which case it is plain that they will not leave slavery behind as an everlasting occasion of new rebellions; or else the rebels will be able to hold their own sufficiently long to entitle them to erect their rebellion into a revolution, by the acknowledgment of their independence—in which case the Northern Republic would be a non-slaveholding one, and the Southern must in time become like unto it or perish from among nations. So that we are compelled to differ with our English friends in their wish for a definite plan and a specific end. Events are imperial, and they will shape out a plan and compel a purpose, precisely at the inevitable moment.

We must be permitted one word of reply to the expostulation of Mrs. Martineau as "to the language used on each and every side, filling us with dread and horror—and I fear I must add, disgust." Mrs. Martineau doubtless remembers the old slang about "harsh language"; how any amount of abuse was legitimate when applied to the Abolitionists, while the descriptions of the horrors of slavery by them were denounced as libellous and atrocious. We fear our English friends may be betrayed, through ignorance of the facts of the case, into an inconsequence scarcely less marked than that. Mrs. M. speaks of the language quoted by *The Times* correspondent as applied to the North. What has provoked those brutal diatribes? They do not accuse us of murdering or robbing them, or depriving them of any right in the North. All the crimes we are charged with are making laws to have the question legally tried whether a man claimed as a slave be one or not, and endeavoring, ineffectually, to keep slavery, by law, out of the Territories of the United States. This is the provocation we have given the South for the abuse she has heaped upon us, and which may well excite the disgust of well-bred Englishmen. We do not know what speeches and writings of the North are joined in this censure, and so we cannot say whether or not they deserve to be put in such company. We have never seen or heard such. But admitting the fact, what was the provocation? If we recollect aright, there were some strong expressions of disapproval uttered in England at the time of the Sepoy Massacres. Perhaps they were as strong as anything said at the North about the South. We might, or might not, have criticized their good taste; but we never forgot the occasion. Now, we affirm that within the last three years, since the Reign of Terror has been preparing in anticipation of the secession, there have been as many innocent men put to death in cold blood, with added horrors of torture, as were murdered in India by the Sepoys. Had these murders been concentrated instead of being scattered over thousands of miles, they would have thrilled Christendom with horror. The crime of these miserable men was sometimes a trumped up pretence of conspiring insurrection; but, generally, mere confession or suspicion of loyalty to the nation. To be a northern man was almost certain death in some regions of the country. Then, again, tens and scores of thousands of men, women and children, have been driven from their homes, robbed of all they had and reduced from competence to beggary for no other crimes than these. We say nothing of the public robberies of public property and the ruin brought upon the commercial classes by the shameless repudiation of debt. But, in view of our provocation, we think our English friends should bear with us of the North if we should have sometimes used language strong enough to express the indignation such atrocities ought to excite in every human breast. We think they must admit that it is not in the power of language to exaggerate them.

PETITION TO CONGRESS.—The following petition is being circulated for signatures in Jewett City, Ct., and vicinity. We wish that measures could be adopted to circulate it in every portion of the free States, for we are confident that tens of thousands would sign it gladly, and the influence upon Congress would be most happy. Will not our readers make a copy and circulate it in their respective neighborhoods?

To the U. S. Senate and House of Representatives, in Congress assembled.

The undersigned, a portion of the loyal People of the United States, lamenting, in common with many others, the numerous evils of Civil War, respectfully petition that you will take such immediate measures for the entire removal of the Cause of this War—being, in our view, the continued permission of Slavery—as the Wisdom and Patriotism of your Honorable Bodies may devise.

MARIUS R. ROBINSON, of Salem, Columbiana Co., Ohio, is a local agent of THE STANDARD, to receive payments from old or new subscribers.

PRO AND CON.

FOR Abolitionists there is no such thing as despondency, because there is no such thing as defeat. Their success is a question only of time. Not only is truth great, but it will prevail. As to the particular period in which its success will become apparent, that is not our affair. All that we are responsible for is the diligent use of the right means. For ultimate success, as the result of such use of such means—and for a measure of success, actual, however little apparent, in proportion to our diligence therein—God is responsible. We know this no less assuredly than if we saw it. Wherever sight fails, faith steps in, making our confidence clear, strong, unwavering; and of her we know, as surely as Dr. Watts knew, that

"The want of sight she well supplies."

Probably, each of us has, at one time or another, guessed this, that and the other, respecting the prospective termination of slavery. But when our guess, in regard to time, has proved unfounded, this has never hindered our perseverence. We shall be glad to *see* the abolition of slavery. But whether we see it with mortal eyes or not, we purpose that it shall be done, and we know that our work is helping towards it, and laying deep and strong the foundation of a higher and better social state than the present. To secure the accomplishment of this is God's work; to help towards it is ours; and it is not only our work but our hope, our joy, our crown of rejoicing. As Dr. Watts says, again—

"He that hath loved us bears us through,
And makes us more than conquerors too."

Holding this hope and faith, we need not shrink from looking steadily at the adverse circumstances and aspects of the contest in which we are engaged. As the scale of battle sinks, now on this side, now on that, we may calmly survey our apparent want of success, as well as our obvious success, and draw instruction from both, for use in the remainder of the campaign. We purpose now to speak, briefly, of one favorable and one unfavorable aspect of the present time.

The favorable aspect is, that the contest is getting to be more and more understood, by the mass of the Northern people, to be "irrepressible." *We* have always known the difference between freedom and the slave system to be thus diametrical. The population of the free States do not yet see this, but they see now that the career of insolent aggression on the part of the South must be stopped, and that the resources of the nation must be directly and actively applied to that work. They see plainly that such energetic remedial agency must be used against rebels, though they yet fail to see what has always been manifest to us, that the Southern people are rebels only because they are slaveholders. Mournfully, suicidally tolerant of the latter relation, they stand as one man in resolute and partinacious resistance to the former. Our encouragement is that the weakening and overthrow of the latter relation will advance in equal measure with the weakening and overthrow of the former.

The unfavorable aspect is that our Northern people are so slow in seeing that slavery is the real enemy with which they have to contend; so slow in seeing that, however thoroughly *this* rebellion may be crushed, another and another must necessarily grow from the same root, while the root is suffered to live. They are acting as foolishly as a sufferer from intermittent fever who should confine himself to palliative instead of curative measures; who should do nothing but try to get warm in the cold stage, and try to get cool in the hot stage, without using any means to remove the disease, the cause, alike, of both his extremes of discomfort. Not even yet do they understand the things that belong to their social and political peace. Not even yet do they realize the fact that liberty cannot take root, and flourish, and bring forth its fruit, in the same field with slavery. While the disease is thus misunderstood, the treatment can hardly fail to be erroneous.

The course of action taken by the government and the military commanders, and the course of speculation and suggestion in the periodical press, respecting the policy to be exercised towards the slaves of the rebellious States, shows how far the North is from understanding its interest and its duty in this matter. Newly emancipated from the habit of yielding *everything* to the slaveholders, they adhere to the traditionary custom of yielding the points connected with slavery. They hang back from the decisive step that is needful to complete their own triumph, plain as it is that that step is essential and inevitable. Though there is no reason on earth why they should view slavery with the least indulgence, now that the lords of the lash have turned from pretended allies into open enemies, they shrink from the very idea of that powerful word of disenchantment, "EMANCIPATION," the utterance of which would at once strengthen them and weaken their foes. Strange to say, they are afraid of the obvious radical cure, and weakly confine their action to palliative measures, which, of necessity, postpone the inevitable struggle, and leave the crisis still to be met.

"They linger, shivering, on the brink,
And fear to launch away."

It would be of small consequence that this blunder is made by the government, if it were not also made by the people. If the population of every free State, nay, of one half or one quarter of the free States, meeting in State Conventions, should express to the General government their conviction that a proclamation of emancipation to the slaves of the rebellious States was the right course to be taken, and that they would energetically support the Executive in that step and its consequences, the step would be taken. But, while the people remain silent, and three quarters of the Northern periodical press, apparently from the mere force of habit, are still protesting that this movement is not a movement against slavery, and that they have no purpose of interfering with the constitutional right of every Southern man to "wallop his nigger," how can the government be expected to go forward? to advance beyond its accustomed party boundaries? to transcend its miserably inadequate Chicago platform? It remains true of us, as of the Greeks—

"Who would be free, *himself* must strike the blow."

Strange to say, our only confidence that this needful, this indispensable blow will be struck, rests with the slaveholders. Their own folly has insured their persistence in the rebellion. Expecting, by the accustomed bullying, to frighten the North into the accustomed concession, they have passed the Rubicon, and burnt the boats that might have enabled them to retreat. Now, their outrages have been so great, and their boastings so enormous, that, even though ruin stares them in the face, they will fight on, and heap more traitorous and atrocious acts upon those already perpetrated, revealing more and more clearly the despotic tyranny in store for those who submit to them. Constantly stimulated by new acts of invasive violence and fraud—marginal illustrations, in most vivid colors, to the "Pickens and Stealin's Rebellion"—our government and our North will be compelled, however reluctantly, to put their finger upon the weak spot, and open a fire on the flank and in the rear of the enemy, by proclaiming freedom to their slaves. When this shall have been done, a new precedent will have superseded the Dred Scott decision; a new fact will have arisen, rendering the reëstablishment of slavery impossible. Thenceforward, through whatever local and temporary alterations, there must be a constant advance towards the permanent establishment of universal freedom.

Meanwhile, the duty of us, the Abolitionists, is plain and clear. The people having, for a quarter of a century, refused to listen to our voice, the following of which would have prevented the present evils, God has sent them a sterner prophet, Necessity, with power to enforce his just commands. Under his guidance, this great North is now going forward, with an amount of unanimity and energy absolutely unparalleled. As yet only half understanding her necessities, and the things needful for her security, she is acting vigorously *towards* them—in the direction of them. Heretofore averse to spend tens for prevention, she now freely lavishes millions for cure. Heretofore selfishly and exclusively solicitous for the interests of trade, she now offers her ship for the service of the government, shuts up her shop, and marches to the battle-field. The results of the battles now pending, however greatly varying, both in form and substance, from that which we originally wished, must effect a direct weakening of the Slave Power far beyond that which we have yet been able to accomplish. In this large instalment of success we may well rejoice. Our part now is, not to embarrass, by the conspicuous intrusion of unacceptable counsels, that action of the Northern people which, however incomplete, and otherwise open to criticism, is accomplishing part of our object, and is educating its workmen to a better appreciation of the need of radical anti-slavery; but, instead of this, to pursue our accustomed diffusion of light and truth whenever and wherever it can be done in quietness, and without diversion of any part of that popular movement which, meaning to assail the rebel, is by that very act assailing the slaveholder. Our part is, no less, to hold ourselves in readiness for any new action whereby we may usefully cooperate with the great Northern movement now in progress, inclining it more in the direction of a radical remedy. And our part *will be*, when the din of arms has ceased, when the sword has given place to the pen, and negotiation is to frame anew the basis of our government, again to speak with trumpet voice, to cry aloud and spare not, inculcating justice and humanity, rebuking the snaky insinuations of compromise, pointing out, with unsparing denunciation, any new beginnings of such evil as we now suffer under, and doing what may be done to have our next experiment one of freedom, not in name only, but in deed and in truth.

GRATUITOUS WICKEDNESS.

IT seems to be generally taken for granted, that the leaders of the American army, in restoring fugitive slaves to loyal masters, and in offering to put down slave insurrections, are only discharging a duty devolved upon them by the Constitution and the laws, and from which, however disagreeable or even revolting it may be to their better feelings, there is no escape except by a deliberate violation of their oaths. This, however, is a great mistake, as we shall attempt to show.

The provision of the Constitution (Art iv. Sec. 2) relating to fugitives from service or labor is in these words:

"No person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, *escaping into another*, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up, on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due."

It is clear, from the very terms of this provision, that the Federal government is under obligation to "deliver up" fugitives from "service or labor" *only* when they are found in a State *other than that in which they have been held as slaves*. A slaveholder in Virginia, for example, has no claim upon the Federal government for the restoration of a fugacious chattel who has not left the State. The master may live at Norfolk, and the fugitive may have crossed the Blue Ridge and taken up his quarters on the Ohio river; but so long as he remains within the limits of the Old Dominion, the master must rely upon State authority exclusively for his return. The Federal government cannot take cognizance of the case, for the fugitive is not such within the meaning of the Constitution. Is not this plain?

Now, the negroes of Virginia who flock to the United States military camps in that State, not being "persons held to service or labor in *one* State, escaping into *another*," are not of the class for whose restoration to bondage the United States Constitution provides; hence the military authorities of the United States are under obligation to "deliver them up" upon no pretence whatever, or even to know them in any other relation than that of free citizens of the United States, at liberty, if loyal to the government, to proceed just as far toward the North Star as their powers of locomotion may carry them. To "deliver them up" to bondage by military power is not to fulfil a constitutional obligation, but to commit an act of *gratuitous* inhumanity and wickedness, repugnant alike to the law of God and the spirit of the age. The Generals may excuse themselves for so doing upon the ground that they are simply obeying the orders of their superiors; but President Lincoln, if he has given such orders, or permitted them to be given by Gen. Scott, committed a gross outrage upon humanity, without even the poor excuse of a constitutional requirement, and proved in the face of the world that Wendell Phillips was right in gibbeting him as "THE SLAVE-HOUND OF ILLINOIS."

We may be asked if we concede the constitutional obligation on the part of the Generals to "deliver up" to their masters, if loyal, the fugitive bondmen who are found beyond the limits of the State in which they are said to "owe service or labor." We say no, decidedly, for slave rendition is no part of their business. Congress, in the law of 1850, has prescribed a way by which masters may recover their lost chattels, and the Federal government is under no obligation to offer any further facilities for the attainment of an object at war with humanity and the fundamental principles of the Constitution.

The offers of Generals Butler and McClellan to suppress slave insurrections are also as gratuitous as they are base; for the Constitution (Art. iv. Sec. 4) requires the United States to protect each of the States "against domestic violence," only upon "*application* of the Legislature, or of the Executive, when the Legislature cannot be convened." If the people of the North are required to take sides with the masters against the slaves, in a contest wherein every attribute of the Almighty is enlisted on the side of the latter, they at least have a right to require the strict observance of all the forms and conditions of such service prescribed in the Constitution. Why should they run before they are sent to make a mock of the principles of the American Revolution, to fight in behalf of the meanest despotism on the face of the earth, and to defy the power of the living God?

THE TARIFF DISCUSSION.

ON the fourth page the reader will find Mr. Greeley's response to Mrs. Martineau's observations on the Protective policy, published by us a fortnight ago. The question lies within our purview only so far as it is connected, incidentally or otherwise, with the question of slavery; but having given place to Mrs. Martineau's observations, we deemed it no more than just that our readers should see what could be said in reply by an eminent champion of the Protective policy. Leaving the arguments on both sides of the main question to the unbiassed consideration of our readers, we are constrained to say that Mrs. Martineau, in our judgment, went much too far in assuming that the new American Tariff, on account of its protective features, was fitted to excite in the Old World an indignation and abhorrence akin to that which should be felt for American slavery, and in declaring, as she did, that the representatives of the North, in enacting that Tariff, "IMITATED THE SOUTH AS CLOSELY AS THEY COULD IN SELFISH GREED AND BLIND CRUELTY AND INJUSTICE"; that they had thereby justly forfeited "the respect and sympathy of the Old World"; that "unless they reverse their proceeding, ALL IS OVER WITH THE REPUTATION AND THE PROSPECTS OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE, in their relations with the rest of human society," and "THE GREAT AMERICAN EXPERIMENT WILL HAVE FAILED IN ALL PARTS OF THE REPUBLIC." This language, applied to a question of political economy, involving no issue of fundamental morality or personal freedom, is extravagant, to say the least, and fitted rather to provoke severe retort than to enlighten and convince the mind of the impartial reader. The Protective system, judged by the known laws of political economy, may or may not be sound; on that point *we* say nothing; let the champions on both sides implead one another, while the people weigh the arguments and form their conclusions as impartially as they can. But the love of fair play, as well as regard for simple truth, impels us to say, that, in this country at least, there is no more ground for speaking of Protectionists as an "oligarchy," impelled by "selfish greed and blind cruelty and injustice," than there is for bringing the same charge against Free Traders. If the manufacturers of the country, in desiring Protection, are selfish and greedy, not less so are the merchant princes of the commercial towns, who plead for Free Trade; and if the latter are sincere in thinking that their doctrines, carried out, would conduce to the welfare, not of one class only, but of the whole people, so also are the former most thoroughly convinced that what they desire would insure the highest pecuniary prosperity not of themselves alone, but of the entire country. The judgment of both is probably swayed, to a greater or less extent, by self-interest; while of the masses of the farmers and mechanics of the North, who are most capable of understanding the question, it is only fair to say that a large majority are in favor of Protection. On the other hand, a large majority of the unintelligent voters have usually gone with the South and her Northern allies for Free Trade. We say this, not because it is an argument in favor of Protection, for it is not, but in reply to Mrs. Martineau's imputations upon the champions of that system.

The British nation is zealous for Free Trade, but we do not believe that the people of that country are one whit more disinterested in the matter than are the friends of Protection in this country; and we are free to say that we place but a light estimate upon that sympathy with the anti-slavery struggle in America which can be dampened or averted on account of the Morrill Tariff. The questions of Free Trade and of Slavery are not, in our judgment, parallel questions, and we must regard as unsound the assumption that a tax upon imposts, for protective purposes, however mistaken, is a "tyranny" so grave as to be fitly compared with a system which extorts labor by the lash, without compensation, and makes merchandize of God's image.

RUMORS OF COMPROMISE.

FOR some days past there have been rumors that a scheme was on foot to patch up a compromise with the rebels, by an offer from Congress to guarantee the existence of slavery in all new territory South of the line of 36 deg. 30 min. It is said that Jeff. Davis is appalled at the condition in which he is placed, and that he has actually sent agents to the North to persuade his old Democratic friends to give him a chance to come back into the Union on the condition above named. Some of the journals profess to believe this story, while by others it is discredited. Our own belief is that there is, at least, some truth in it—that secret efforts have been made to rally a peace-compromise party at the North, but that these efforts have not met with much success. In some quarters it is positively affirmed that Southern leaders have gone so far as to sound the Administration on the subject; in others, the story is flatly contradicted. *The Herald*, of Wednesday, says:

"The various rumors as to the propositions made by the leaders of the Southern Confederacy for peace and a reconstruction of the two sections of the country, appear to resolve themselves into the simple fact that, as we learn, Jefferson Davis has addressed a communication to President Lincoln proposing peace, on the grounds merely that, as the United States government must be convinced of the impossibility of conquering the South, it should do now what it must eventually do after a long and bloody war—namely, recognize the independence of the Southern Confederacy. He does not propose that Congress shall pass any act relative to slavery, nor does he refer to the payment of the expenses of the war, or the withdrawal of troops, as reported in other quarters, but simply that, as the sanction of Congress will be necessary to ratify the recognition of the Southern government, he suggests that no progress be made on either side until Congress meets; and he pledges himself that no aggressive act on the part of the South shall take place if his proposition is favorably considered, until it is ascertained how Congress will act in the premises. He gives a succinct statement of the strength and resources of the South, and compliments the United States government for the activity with which it is pouring troops into the field, and he concludes his letter by saying that "the spectacle of four hundred thousand men—let me say brothers—thus arrayed against each other, with the most destructive weapons of modern warfare in their hands, is a sight from which the patriot turns away appalled. In Heaven's name, let us not drive them into actual conflict. If possible, let us avert a collision the horrors of which will have no parallel." No answer has yet been returned to this communication, nor has the Administration the slightest intention of making any compromise, or entering into any negotiation with the rebels, upon the basis of Mr. Davis's proposition."

If any scheme of compromise is on foot, it must show itself when Congress meets, and then the country will know how to meet it. It affords us much satisfaction to be able to say that, so far as we have observed, not a single Northern press, with the exception of a few journals that have sympathized with the traitors from the start, has shown any disposition to make peace on any terms short of the complete submission of the rebels. Even Bennett's *Herald*, for a wonder, cries out against compromise as lustily as *The Tribune*. In *The Herald* of Wednesday is a dispatch from Washington, of which this is an extract:

"This city is cursed at the present time with an arrival of beings known as compromisers. They claim to represent an immense financial and moral influence in Philadelphia and New York. I am happy to state, from the highest authority, that there is not the slightest intention on the part of the government to treat with rebels, from Jeff. Davis down to the meanest Pryor among them. On the contrary, it was settled this very day to pour down upon them speedily the aroused legions of the North, and to prosecute the war with such numbers and such vigor as shall leave no chance for doubt in the minds of the violators of good government that the Administration, and the loyal people who support it, are in earnest. A spirit is being aroused that will result in placing the man who shall dare offer a proposition to compromise with traitors in the same category, and to hang both. The feeling against anything of the kind is so intense here, at the present time, that it is believed a man who would openly propose to settle with the Southern rebels by compromising would be hung as soon as found."

A COLORED AMERICAN IN ENGLAND.

THE writer of the letter from which we present the following extract is a brother of "LINDA," the fugitive slave, whose remarkably interesting life, written by herself, and revised by Mrs. Child, was lately reviewed in our columns. The letter was addressed to our friend, ISAAC POST, of Rochester.

LONDON, June 5th, 1861.

MY DEAR FRIEND: I hope you will not judge me by my long silence. Believe me, it does not characterize the language of my heart. I do not like much to deal with words, but with actions. You and your family have shown yourselves friends to me and mine, and not to me only, but to my oppressed brethren, for whose sake I hope our Father and our God will reward you all. You that have believed in the promise, and obeyed his word, are beginning to see the moving of His hand to execute judgment and bestow mercy. Those who have long sown chains and fetters will reap blood and carnage. Their troubles have begun; God only knows where they will end. The excitement in London is daily increasing, but the greater portion of the people seem to be ignorant of the character of the slaveholder and of the cause of the disturbed state of the Union, and still more so with regard to the best means of abolishing slavery. Yesterday I read the views of one man who believed it best to let the old slaves work out the freedom of their children, and when they have died off, then let the children be free, and there would be an end to the evil. This reminded me of the story of the poor-house, which I will not repeat. Last night I heard our tried and true friend, George Thompson, who t

Our Boston Correspondence.

FROM AN OCCASIONAL CORRESPONDENT.

THE SUMMARY.—Saint Botolph's day—Who he is and why celebrated—The Commanders in lawn and epaulets—The episode of the Rector—Governor Andrew in regimentals—His singular discretion therein—The new "Aids to Reflection," or Coleridge in fancy binding—The horses of Col. Lawrence and Richard III. an historical parallel—Sunday at the Music Hall—The Peace pamphlet in pieces—Mr. Crittenden against the war.

BOSTON, June 24th, 1861.

SHALL the outer or inner life that has lived itself on this Shawmut peninsula since I last wrote you make its precipitate on this blank paper? Perhaps I had better first report what we have been doing, and then disclose, so far as epistolary limitations permit, what we have been thinking. The last week was given over to various shows and pageants. It commenced with the celebration of Saint Botolph's day—i. e., the festival of a deceased gentleman, who is a sort of step-patron to our city. The Lincolnshire Boston, from which we took our name, is, as you know or should know, only a popular contraction of Botolph's town; and it is well argued that we have an interest in the prayers and good offices of the Confessor in return for his transatlantic compliment. Perhaps the fact that the Battle of Bunker Hill was fought on the day which the Calender devotes to his memory ensures a fuller recognition than would otherwise be accorded him. At all events, he must be a most fastidious Saint, if he took exception to the solemnities of Monday last. He had his fill of flag-raising in the morning, and cannons of Church and State in the afternoon. Major Cobb commanded the civil thunderers upon the Common, while Bishop Eastburn mustered the ecclesiastical ordnance just over the way. The pretext for this latter congregation was found in the corner-stone of Dr. Huntington's church, which was finally *laid*—and with it, I trust, a portion of the gossip, liberal and illiberal, which that gentleman's conversion has occasioned. His apostacy (or *istacy*, if you are of his present way of thinking) was of small importance to the general world; yet he has been prated into such notoriety by the persistent efforts of friends and foes, that his pictures seem to be about the only fancy articles vendible in these hard times. One cannot go into a book store or print-shop without being offered photographs of Dr. Huntington, in several varieties of dress and attitude. He is to be bought half-length or whole length, standing up or sitting down, with surplice or without. The dealers assure me that General Scott, Jeff. Davis, Tom Thumb, and Mr. Everett, like Time in the prologue, can only pant after him in vain. All this, because our learned Dr. Hedge couldn't resist showing him up in a review article!

To return to the Saint and his festival. I had some curiosity to see our Governor "assume the post of Mars," which by newspaper advertisement he was to do that afternoon. And I must say he did it with great modesty and discretion. His regimentals consisted of a brass button or two, and a featherless hat of inconspicuous cock—a pleasing contrast, certainly, to the finery in which his Aids had bedecked themselves. Our people, just now, have little tolerance for the superfluous trappings of soldiers by courtesy. The regiments which have passed through our city have shown the simple dress of workingmen who go to fight for the country, and provoke many good-natured comments upon the glitter of the Cadets who gallantly lead them to the station. Truth compels me to declare that to the crowd, on the occasion in question, the Governor, and even his Aids, seemed of very minor interest. The chief enthusiasm appeared to centre about Col. Lawrence's horse, a beast which the newspapers informed us had been bestridden by the Prince of Wales, and was of great pedigree and promise. Accordingly, every kick and caper of this gracious animal was received with marked consideration. You would have thought him descended from the charger for which King Richard offered his kingdom; and that, too, when there were *six* Richmonds in the field, instead of the sorry *one* against which we are embattled. If there had been an Emperor, or even a Bourbon, among us, the classical precedent would doubtless have suggested making him Consul on the spot. As it is, I commend his case to the handsome Colonels who, *The Post* declares, have usurped the appointing power at the State House. Would it not be a proper recognition of his very showy qualities on parade to make him a Brigadier, or Major at the least? The appointment would seem quite as proper as several which have been made, and the claims for distinction are certainly identical with those of successful candidates.

To keep up the excitement of the week, we had two receptions of regiments, and two collations; the latter at the Music Hall, with cheers, toasts and speeches, which I didn't hear. They could have been nothing, however, to what I did hear in that same Music Hall on Sunday. We were then instructed by the presence and speech of Mrs. Lucretia Mott. The perfect simplicity of manner was in true accordance with the effortless and spontaneous flow of her language. I never heard any one so absolutely unreportable; for the quality of her thought seemed to be personified, rather than uttered. It is pleasant to see a woman called to speak in public who is characterized by that simple repose which is the best testimony to health of mind and body. What has been said about some of Mozart's melodies struck me as distinguishing Mrs. Mott's address from those spoken by many other women—it was not an *invention*, but an *existence*.

I have hardly room to notice properly the second topic proposed for treatment. One shudders a little at anticipating an insurrection of the old diversities of opinion; but the signs of it are discernable. Yet, if you hear any talk of moderation and compromise from the eastward, know that it is sincerely urged for the interest of freedom, not of slavery. An instance of our disposition to listen to extreme language against fighting may be found in the circulation of a pamphlet by Mr. J. P. Blanchard, an esteemed member of Dr. Gannett's Church, known for years as a faithful and uncompromising advocate of peace. There is much that is well-considered and suggestive in his appeal, if we begin by acknowledging that the present hopeful condition of the North was attained by a worthy resort to arms. But the cause of the original rising of our section is grievously misstated. The present martial movement, declares the writer, "is not the alarmed agitation of a community menaced with invasion for the safety of their rights and homes." Pardon us, sir, but it *is* this exactly; we took arms to prevent slavery from swallowing us up altogether, as it was on the point of doing. The conspirators never wished merely to go out of the Union, but to destroy the Union and whatever of liberty was in it, in going out. The most influential journal in the country was willing to let them go from the first, provided they would go in such a manner as to leave an organized government behind them. The rising of the people was strictly in self-defence, to maintain their homes and liberties against moral and physical invasion. The right of secession, so warmly advocated in this pamphlet, must imply a correlative right in the majority to suppress it when they regard it as a crime and a nuisance. The difference of opinion in New England will turn upon the question, at what point the unanimity and nationality of the North will have been sufficiently vindicated to allow certain States to go under such guarantees as the interests of freedom require. Many of Mr. Blanchard's remarks are very sensible and discriminating, and will sustain more acceptable premises than those which they follow. But I fear the time to talk of peace is not yet. Let us remember that Mr. Crittenden of Kentucky is as devoted a friend of peace as Mr. Blanchard himself, and goes to the next Congress pledged to obtain it by enthroning slavery more securely than before.

* * X.

MRS. MOTT IN BOSTON.—Lucretia Mott delivered a discourse, on Sunday morning last, before the Twenty-eighth Congregational Society (late Theodore Parker's), in the Music Hall. The *Atlas and Bee* of Monday says:

"The audience was very large and nearly filled the hall. After singing and the reading of Scriptures, the latter by Mr. Garrison, Mrs. Mott took the desk and spoke for upwards of an hour, from the text, "He being dead, yet speaketh." The address was of a discursive nature, and treated of many subjects, but chiefly of the faith which the world should have in religion, virtue and humanity. She took occasion to give some pretty vigorous blows at the dogmas of the day, and also paid high eulogies to the memory of Channing and Parker. The closing portion of her address related to the war, which she hoped would be prosecuted with energy and faith, since it was founded upon so good a cause. She thought the greatest danger would be in listening to compromises, which would only result in again fighting the old battle.

"Mrs. Mott is now seventy years old. She formerly resided in Boston, and said that here, of all places, liberal sentiments and great progress should exist. She spoke without notes, and with much fluency, and kept the congregation to the close."

Our Washington Correspondence.

WASHINGTON, June 24, 1861.

THE rebels certainly seem to be getting the best of it across the river, and instead of our armies keeping the Fourth of July at Richmond, it looks a good deal as if Beauregard and mad-cap Wise would take a Fourth-of-July dinner at Arlington House, not to mention General Lee who owns the house. It is to be supposed that General Scott knows what he is about, and that everything will come out just right in the end, like all the fairy tales. But to us, poor mortals, who haven't served an apprenticeship to the trade of war, things look queerly. A man from a little way down the Potomac writes as follows to a gentleman in Washington. Does he not state the facts with some degree of force? He says:

"It is very apparent to those who are acquainted with the Potomac, Rappahannock and York rivers, and other points on the Chesapeake, that the Southern forces, led by experienced resigned engineers and naval officers, are preparing batteries at various places on those rivers, which, before we are aware, will totally close their navigation—that of the Potomac in particular. Thus far, they have had all the opportunities they could desire for the purpose, and are availing themselves of them, no doubt, most effectively. The United States, meanwhile, are doing—what? Sending a little cockboat, or a miserable shell of a river steamboat, to pop a few guns at them—getting the boats well peppered, and the men killed. Can nothing more be done to keep open the river by which the seat of government gets its supplies from Baltimore and beyond the Capes? Before long, when the absolute necessity of vigorous action becomes apparent, every available point of defense will be so well guarded that a large army will be requisite to remove, with immense bloodshed and loss, what might easily be prevented. I confess my ignorance of military matters, but these are the views I humbly submit."

The leaders of the rebels seem to strike quickly, and we are all the time *following their movements*. They *do* retreat from certain places, but at the same time seem to be advancing towards Washington, or at least choosing their place for defence.

There is no use in attempting to deny that the rebels have a great deal of military talent among their leaders—more, probably, than we have at the head of our troops. But talented officers cannot overcome great disparity in force and means. The contest must eventually show the weakness of a Confederacy or Rebellion which rests upon human slavery as its corner-stone.

There are more slaves in our camps than most people imagine. The soldiers generally take to the poor fellows when they offer themselves, and set them quietly at work upon pay within the camp lines. A friend, who has just made the tour of the camps in and around Washington, tells me that he was very much surprised to see such numbers of fugitive slaves in them. When these regiments return to the North, they will take a great many slaves along with them to a land of freedom. They will appear to be attached to the regiments, and it will be found impossible to prove them to be "bound to service" to anybody in Dixie's Land, for the evidence will be lacking.

There was an amusing occurrence on one of our principal streets a few days ago. A policeman undertook to arrest a negro in the vicinity of Colonel Cowden's new Boston regiment, which had just arrived. The Boston boys interfered and rescued the colored man. Twenty policemen soon came upon the ground, and retook the colored man, when five times that number of Massachusetts men again took him from the legal Secession pimps of the street. *The negro remained with the regiment!* The Boston boys said he belonged to their regiment. The policemen said no, he was a resident of Washington. At all events, he is to-day in the camp of the Bay State men. It is impossible to crush out sympathies, and all the Constitutions and army-orders in the world will not make good slave-catchers out of Northern freemen. As a general rule, the men in our armies understand that this war was made necessary by the infamous conduct of Southern slaveholders, and they have little disposition to turn slave-catchers for those very men, or any of their sympathizers. More than this: they desire very much to put an end *to the cause of the war*. I know that this feeling is very strong among our troops, though most of them see the difficulties in the way of forcible emancipation.

There is a good deal of feeling against Mr. Cameron for his reappointment of Lieut. Emory, of Maryland, to his old place in the army. Remember the facts. Emory is a Marylander, and the day after the Baltimore authorities burned down the bridges over the Gunpowder, Emory made haste to tender a conditional resignation. If Maryland went out of the Union, he wished to go with her. The War Department very properly struck his name from the army rolls. But now, without one word of explanation, the sneaking traitor is put back in his old place! He got sick of his treason, wanted his pay, probably, became convinced that Maryland could not go out of the Union if she would, and Simon Cameron, Secretary of War, reinstates him in his old position!

I hear that the Administration is a little afraid that the sentiment of the North is growing more favorable to separation and peace. In short, that the loyal States will not furnish men and means for the great war which has but just begun. Now, it is easy to perceive that if the Administration is to become thoroughly corrupted by knavery in the distribution of contracts and places, and if the people get an idea that the men at the head of affairs are dishonest, they will hang back from furnishing men and money to continue the war. The men will have no confidence that they will not be made the prey of thievish contractors, and monied men will believe that their money, instead of helping on the war, only goes into the pockets of army contractors. So, if the Administration desires to be supported heartily by the people, *it must be honest*.

You are aware that a good deal of noise is made over the fact, that Mr. Harvey, Minister to Portugal, is not recalled after having been proved guilty of furnishing the enemy with information. The Foreign Secretary refuses to recall Mr. Harvey, and keeps his reason to himself. My own opinion is, that Harvey is not guilty of treason, actual or implied. His friends here say that he got permission of Mr. Seward to send what he did send to Charleston, and furthermore, that he sent the same news to the columns of *The Tribune*, where it was published. This is the statement of some of his friends here, and it may be false; but if not, it is difficult to see why Harvey should be recalled. He never was an anti-slavery man—was scarcely a Republican—and one-half the members of Lincoln's Cabinet liked him all the better for that. There is no reason, therefore, for crying him down because he is on good terms with slavery. The President knew it when he appointed him to the office, and everybody in Washington knew it.

The Northern men here do not at all like the report that one of the Rhode Island regiments has, in a very officious manner, been arresting and returning fugitive slaves. Even according to the strict letter of the Fugitive Slave enactment, the work is uncalled for and illegal. One Northern Senator declares his purpose to put a bill through Congress prohibiting any negro-catching on the part of our army or navy. Chancing to overhear a street debate on this question, the other day, one remark struck me as forcible. It came from the lips of a New England Senator, and was as follows: "Great heavens! is *this* a time, when we are waging a war such as we have never seen, not only to offend the moral sense of the civilized world but to provoke a righteous God? If our troops are going to turn negro-catchers, *of course*, God Almighty will turn them over to destruction!" The Congressman may have been mistaken in his *sequiter*, but is there not a good deal of point in his remark?

This whole matter is likely to come up for discussion in Congress, for the people who are carrying on this war do not fancy some of the orders of our Generals.

AVON.

CONGRESS will meet on Thursday next, the Fourth of July, and it is thought that the President's message will be communicated on the same day. It is said by those in the confidence of the Administration that it will take strong ground in favor of prosecuting the war as vigorously and rapidly as possible, and that it will contain no whisper or suggestion of compromise.

"SOUND ON THE GOOSE."—A soldier of the Second Vermont Regiment, which passed through this city to Washington on Tuesday, was asked by a friend of ours if he was ready to return to their masters the fugitive slaves that might come to the camp. His eye glowed like fire as he replied, "No; before I would do anything so mean, even if commanded by an officer, I would be shot." That soldier is "sound on the goose," and we presume that nine of every ten members of the Vermont regiments, if interrogated, would give a similar answer. Why will not the government respect the conscientious scruples of the soldiers, who feel that slave-catching, of all human functions, is the most degrading and loathsome?

MEMORIAL TO THE PRESIDENT.

GHENT, N. Y., June 24, 1861.

To the Editor of The National Anti Slavery Standard.

WE have arranged here to hold a series of monthly anti-slavery meetings the present season, and have organized an association, to thoroughly distribute tracts, and otherwise more effectively to influence public sentiment. The officers are J. Anna Rice Powell, President; E. M. Powell, Secretary; E. Hogeboom, Treasurer; with an additional Tract Committee. The nucleus is small, but from it we hope good results. At a meeting yesterday the enclosed memorial to the President was adopted. Might not, with much profit, petitions of similar import be sent to the President, in large numbers, from all parts of the North, at this juncture of affairs? Yours truly, A. M. P.

MEMORIAL.

To the Hon. Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States:

We, your memorialists, representing the Ghent Anti-Slavery Association, deeply lament the existence of civil war. Tracing the present unhappy conflict now in progress upon American soil to its manifest source, we find it to be in an unholy, determined purpose, on the part of those in traitorous rebellion against the authority of the United States, to perpetuate and extend the dominion of chattel slavery. Property in man is regarded as a chief corner-stone in the basis of government, and just democratic principles are boldly and defiantly repudiated by these rebels. They have enjoyed an undisturbed security for slavery in the past, under the protection of the United States government—for many years have been allowed a supremacy in the administration of government, and have had everything conceded to them which they have chosen to demand—this to the lasting shame and discredit of the North, it must be said. They are now waging a most brutal and murderous warfare upon the government which has so faithfully protected them in their slaveholding barbarism, and they loudly threaten the destruction, or the subjugation, of the people of the North, because they have been denied their wonted supremacy in the government. They affect to regard as lost their past security for slavery.

In armed rebellion against the United States, their slaves, old and young, are made available, in all possible ways, to aid and strengthen their armies, in producing supplies at home, in performing the drudgery of camp life and of field service. Slaves thus enable the rebels to prosecute and continue the war. We hold that, in common with the rest of mankind, these slaves have an inalienable, undoubted right to liberty, and that, as slaves, they are made to strengthen the hands of traitors and rebels, they should be at once declared free, emancipated.

We, therefore, earnestly petition you, as Chief Executive of the nation, in the exercise of the rights and power vested in you, that justice may be done, the blessings of liberty extended, that the present unhappy and disastrous war may be the more speedily and certainly terminated, and a permanent and righteous peace be established, to proclaim emancipation to the slaves of all the States and Territories under the constitutional jurisdiction of the United States government. In the emergency of war, you are not without the authority of precedent for the use of such power in the past history of the government, and in return for its exercise in the present instance you would, we believe, receive the generous support and sympathy of a vast majority of your constituency and the grateful commendation of the entire civilized world.

In behalf of the Association,
J. A. R. POWELL, President.

E. M. POWELL, Secretary.

THE SLAVEHOLDER'S SCRIPTURE COMMENTARY.—I.

"I AM the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage." *Inference.*—We have the "divine right" to hold in chattel servitude just as many men, women and children as we can steal, kidnap, buy or breed.

"Thou shalt have no other gods before me." *Inference.*—If my slave does not submit to and obey *me*, before any other being in the universe, I am at liberty to "flog him within an inch of his life," or shoot him if he offer any resistance.

"Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." *Inference.*—My slave is bound to serve me as his *lord supreme*; I claim his "body and spirit" as mine; and with this undivided worship, no being, in heaven or earth, is to interfere.

"Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain." *Inference.*—We appeal to God and the testimony of his Word, that he has instituted the relation between master and slave, and made it as sacred and inviolable as the marriage covenant.

"Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy; in it thou shalt not do any work." *Inference.*—It is optional with me whether my slaves work or not; and if I bid them labor, they refuse at their peril.

"Honor thy father and thy mother." *Inference.*—That is—compel that boy to obey this precept, by plying the cowskin, "well laid on," to his mother's naked back, or to flog his father, at my discretion; provided that his father is a *slave*, and not myself, my legitimate son, overseer, or some other white man.

"Thou shalt not kill." *Inference.*—I can beat my slave to death, if he will not otherwise submit; for that, in the eye of law, is "moderate correction." Who, but a fanatic, ever charged *murder* upon LILBURN LEWIS, for cutting up and burning, piecemeal, his slave George?*

"Thou shalt not commit adultery." *Inference.*—These mulattoes, quadroons, and all shades of complexion, are monuments of *purity*. Hence, also, it is right for me to sell Jack away from Sal and her children, and compel her to take Jim in his stead; for, peradventure, by the blessing of God, the change may increase my stock of human cattle.

"Thou shalt not steal." *Inference.*—If my negro steal *himself* from me, I will recover him, if I can, dead or alive; and if alive, no punishment can be too severe for *his* violation of the eighth commandment. Hence, also, it is in accordance with this precept for me to take from the negro all that he *is*, all that he *has*, and *all that he can earn*; and beat or kill him if he attempt to withhold from me a stiver. None but a fanatic will call this either stealing or robbing. How can a negro be robbed of himself when he does not own himself, and "has no rights which the white man is bound to respect?"†

"Thou shalt not bear false witness." We hence affirm, that all whom we hold in slavery are fit only for that condition, and inferior to us, who were born to rule. "Capital ought to own labor." Those who say that this is not the meaning of the ninth commandment, bear "false witness against" US!

"Thou shalt not covet." Therefore, we desire and determine still to possess the bodies, souls and uncompensated labor of four million of human brutes, and as many more as we can purchase, breed or take; for the tenth commandment is a guarantee of this *right*. Hence, also, the thirty thousand fugitives in Canada, and all others who would get away if they could, are infinitely *guilty* of violating this commandment. It must be so; for, they have *coveted themselves*, their *liberty*, and everything which can belong only to us gentlemen slaveholders!

Such are concise statements of *practical* slaveholding logic. If any of our Northern divines think that it is Divinity which needs Doctoring, and are disposed to employ their skill for the purpose, they shall, as the razor-strop-man used to say, be furnished with "a few more" samples "of the same sort." ALETHEIA.

North Latitude, 45 deg., 1861.

* See Rankin's Letters.

† Judge Taney.

THE GREAT DUTY OF THE HOUR.—We take pleasure in giving notice that Edward Gilbert, Esq., a sound-hearted as well as clear-headed young lawyer of this city, and one of the few members of the profession who penetrate through all its technicalities to the solid rock of vital truth, will speak in the Church of the Puritans, on Union Square, to-morrow (Sunday) evening, upon "The Rights and Duties of the Government in the Present Crisis." We hope he may have a full house, for we are sure that his discourse will throw light upon principles of great practical moment and give a fresh impetus to the anti-slavery cause.

Chronicles of the War.

THE history of the past week is marked by no single event of great importance, but the news which reaches us from various quarters is of sufficient interest to make us regret that the space at our command is so small. The forces of the United States are being rapidly augmented at every important point on the Southern frontier. The whole number enlisted and under pay cannot be much less than 225,000. On the line of the Potomac the two armies stand almost face to face, but neither party appears to be prepared to open battle. The strength of the rebel force in this quarter is variously estimated, and the most conflicting stories as to the condition of the men and the intentions of their leaders are in circulation. Sometimes it looks as if we were on the eve of a bloody battle, and then again we are inclined to think that the enemy will soon fall back upon Richmond, and that the main struggle will be at that point. Speculation, however, is useless, and we must wait for Gen. Scott to unfold his plans by actual movements.

In the region South and West of Harper's Ferry the rebels are in considerable force, for the purpose of checking the movements of Gen. Patterson on the North and of Gen. McClellan on the West. Unless they give way, there must be hard fighting somewhere in this region before long, for Gen. Scott cannot allow his Northern and Western columns to be cut off from direct communication with the centre.

In Western Virginia the Provisional State Government has been fully organized, and the great majority of the people are rallying to its support. The rebels, however, are working desperately, and in some places with a degree of success. Ex-Governor Wise is said to be working his way westward at the head of a considerable force, and it is evidently the intention of the rebels, if possible, to prevent General McClellan from crossing the Alleghanies. We do not think they can long succeed in doing this, but they may delay his advance for a time. Their depredations upon property, and the reign of terror which they inaugurate at every step, excite the indignation of many, even of those who have heretofore sympathised with the rebel cause. The damage they have done to the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad is estimated at $2,000,000. At Martinsburg, a few days since, they burned locomotives and cars valued at $400,000.

A large force has been sent up the valley of the Kanawha, to protect the loyal people of that region, and it is said to be the intention of Gen. Scott to send a column through the South-western corner of the State, to move upon Richmond in conjunction with his other lines.

Gen. Pillow threatens an attack by his Tennessee rebels upon Cairo, but the place is believed to be too strong for them.

In Missouri things look pretty well, the promptness and energy of Gen. Lyon having defeated the schemes of the rebels. The traitor Governor, at last accounts, was disguised in petticoats fleeing before a United States force. The Secessionists, it is expected, will make a stand in the South-western corner of the State. The battle at Booneville frightened them terribly, and turned all their plans into confusion.

Eastern Tennessee will probably organize a Provisional Government like that of Western Virginia, to be defended by the aid of the United States forces.

The treaty of neutrality entered into by Gov. Magoffin of Kentucky with Gen. McClellan is believed by many to be only a cover for treason, and it is likely to be repudiated at Washington. Kentucky needs just the medicine which is working so finely in Missouri. The conditional Unionism of such men as Crittenden is far worse than open treason.

The rebels are no doubt fortifying Richmond as fast as they can, and making every arrangement to obstruct the advance of the Union forces. The rebel army is large, though it is impossible to say *how* large; the reports varying from 50,000 to 150,000.

The crew of the privateer Savannah arrived at this port on Monday. They will shortly be tried for piracy.

There is no longer any anxiety as to the position of England. The government has decided to close its ports against the Confederate privateers, and to maintain a position of strict neutrality. Mr. Gregory, the member of Parliament for Galway, was compelled to withdraw his motion for a recognition of the rebel Confederacy. The members of the House would not permit the question to be even discussed. Mr. Gregory subsequently published his brief in the London *Times*, but it is so weak in argument, and so mistaken in matters of fact, that it can do little harm. The British people, though not well informed as to the nature of the war and the issues it involves, are sternly opposed to any recognition of the rebels. Indeed, all the hopes of Jefferson Davis and his associates of receiving help from Europe have been disappointed, and they are compelled to meet the consequences of the rebellion by their own unaided strength. The Southern ports and the Mississippi river are blockaded, and a mighty army is preparing to advance into the Southern territory and crush out treason with a strong hand.

"SABLE CLOUDS."

HUNDREDS OF NEGROES are forced to work, sweltering in the hot sun, upon the rebel intrenchments at Sewall's Point, near Norfolk.

MOVABLE CHATTELS.—Mr. Martin, who resides at Uniontown, Va., opposite the Navy yard, took up a colored boy yesterday, and sent him to jail here. The slave is nineteen years old, and says he belongs to Austin Gore, who lives seven miles below Aquia Creek. His master has gone to the war, and he states that many of the slaveholders have given up their slaves to the use of the rebel forces. When he ran away, he knew of forty free blacks who had been forced into the secession ranks.—*Washington Cor. Times.*

SLAVES IN MARYLAND.—*Hagerstown, June* 17.—I do not observe that the presence of the army in this part of Maryland makes any impression on the negro population, free or slave, except that the display of soldiers causes a large display of "ivory." But these upper Counties of the State form so purely an agricultural and not a planting section, that there are comparatively few negroes here, and they are only a remnant of easy natures, the fractious and dissatisfied having started for the North star or gone to the Southern plantations. Slavery is not profitable here, and remains only because it is a State institution. A gentleman I was conversing with yesterday, who has a number of slaves, said he would not value them at "a dollar a dozen" if the war went on, and he deplored the social necessity which made him a slaveholder. He saw the effect on the young men particularly, inducing indolence and habits of idleness and dissipation, and also the incubus of the institution upon general prosperity and improvement.—*Cor. Tribune.*

GEN. PRENTISS RETURNING FUGITIVE SLAVES.—The Cairo (Illinois) correspondent of The Cincinnati *Commercial* writes, under date of the 19th instant:

"Two fugitive slaves from Ballard County, Kentucky, were arrested here by citizens yesterday, and turned over to the military authorities. They told Gen. Prentiss that they were from Tennessee, knowing that in that case they would be held despite any efforts which might be made for their recovery. The owner arrived last evening, having learned they were here, and immediately had a conversation with Gen. Prentiss upon the matter. The General told him that under the circumstances the slaves should be returned to him, the usual process being performed. Kentucky being still in the Union, her citizens were to receive the benefits of the laws of the United States; and in matters of this nature it was far better, and would act more toward causing those who were favorable to the Union to stand firm than perhaps any other reason. The proceedings passed off quietly."

FEARS OF INSURRECTION—NEGRO SOLDIERS.—A correspondent of *The Times*, writing from Washington, on the 18th inst., says:

"A friend of mine arrived here to-day from Vicksburgh, Miss., which place he left two weeks ago. He says that uneasiness is beginning to be felt at the prospect of an uprising among the slaves. The plantation hands, especially, have a very correct general idea of the condition of the country, and open acts of revolt are by no means of rare occurrence. As an instance, he names the following: A planter, owning several hundred negroes, ordered three of them to do some trivial work; they grumbled, and finally said they would do it, but they needn't without they wanted to, as they could be *free* whenever they liked. In an instant the master drew his revolver, and shot one of them dead on the spot. The next day the master met the other two negroes just as he was coming out of his house. One of them deliberately aimed an old shot-gun at him, and in an instant he was a dead man. The negroes ran off, and had eluded pursuit at the latest accounts. All the 'peculiar institution' seems to want is a *leader*, when a second St. Domingo massacre will be the inevitable consequence.

"All along the route immense droves of men, huddled together like cattle, were wending their way towards Virginia. Nine-tenths of these are composed of the miserable pauper population, ununiformed, unarmed, undisciplined, and entirely beyond the control of their officers. One company, however, has left Vicksburgh, which is quite a novelty in its way. It is about two hundred strong, composed wholly of small property holders, each one of whom carries along a negro servant "boy" to do the hard work. The ebony population bring up the rear (much to their annoyance, as the music is in front), and are not considered as brave as their masters, as on several occasions they have scampered off like frightened sheep, upon hearing the discharge of a few pieces of artillery. The thinking portion of the community are loud in denunciation of the propriety of giving these negroes such a chance of obtaining information which may, at any moment, be turned against themselves."

THE SLAVES WIDE AWAKE.—Colonel Forney writes from Washington to the Philadelphia *Press*:

"I am not of those who desire to see property of our Southern people interfered with. I would unutterably deplore the horrors of a servile insurrection. But, as a faithful historian of the times, it is well that I should say that those who have taken the full responsibility of resisting the Federal authority, and of proscribing all who are found in defence of the American flag, should appreciate the dangers that are rapidly surrounding them, so that when the tempest is let loose they may not prove to be wholly unprepared. Is it possible that a war which starts out with a declaration against free principles, which denounces the people of the free States as ignorant, vulgar, brutal, and inferior, and which, through its numerous agencies, does not hesitate to anticipate the establishment of a monarchy, shall not awaken all those slumbering aspirations in the breast of the colored race for freedom, which Southern statesmen have really always secretly feared? May not, in other words, this race be compelled to take some steps of precaution for their own protection, when they see the war that is waged without mercy upon the whites?

"A gentleman just returned from Virginia—in fact, one who had been expelled from that State because of his Northern birth—informed me that it was interesting to notice the assumed ignorance and indifference of the slaves while in presence of their masters, and that the moment they believed themselves safe, and near a Northern man, or one whom they could trust, they brightened into intelligence, and spoke of passing events with wonderful accuracy and feeling. He told me that he had several copies of Northern newspapers in his room, and that frequently *the servants would steal up to him and beg permission to read for their own information, greedily devouring every fact and opinion, and then going forth to spread among their fellows that which they had acquired.* All these considerations enter largely into the present and future of our country. We cannot ignore them if we would. What is to become of this race—whether it is to be colonized or returned to Africa—are questions which lie far beyond. We have to do simply with what is now transpiring—not, indeed, what we wish to happen, but what we should be fully prepared for."

CONTRABANDS AT CAIRO.—Monday three fugitives arrived at headquarters from the other side of the Ohio, which they ferried in a skiff, and were placed temporarily in the guard-house to await an examination. The oldest of the three is a stout, hearty boy of about twenty-three years, and gives his name as John Ewell. His sister Anne is a bright, intelligent looking girl of seventeen summers, and a brother, still younger, goes by the name of "Little Billy." They represent themselves as having been the slaves of John and Sarah Ewell, of Rev. James Mathew's circuit, in Middle Tennessee. They do not know the name of the County in which they lived, and are not acquainted with any city in either Kentucky or Tennessee. They know of Columbus, Hickman, Smithland, Paducah, Union City, Humboldt and Memphis. As their statements are of some importance in deciding the question as to what shall be done with them, in case some man with a pack of hounds and a long lash lays claim to them, they were examined somewhat closely.

John, in reply to questions put to him, said: We left home about three weeks ago. We have travelled in the night time except when it was very dark. We used to hide in the day time, and we travelled most all the way in the woods. We met some people who was kind to us, but we's 'fraid of everybody. "Is you with these folks?" said he abruptly to his questioner, who replied that he was with those who did right, and, added he—"I am with you, John; this commander and these officers will do you strict justice." He then proceeded: "My mas'r is a sesh'nist. He has a sesh'n flag at his house. It has four bars on it; and the people used to cum thar, and they used all of 'em to hurrah for Jeff. Davis. They tells that they can take Cairo. They hain't got no guns but bird guns, but they say they'll hide in the hollows and shoot these men (of Cairo) and take their guns away. They were afraid these men here 'a Cairo." "Is you with them thar men who's here jis now?" (alluding to Gen. Prentiss and other officers), said he, abruptly breaking off from his story and casting an anxious, half suspicious glance at the door. Then being again reassured, he proceeded: "They's afraid you men here was goin' to come down and burn Memphis and kill all the peoples, an' they said they'se goin' to stop 'em; they'd lie on the ground, and behind logs, and in the woods, and shoot 'em as they came along. They said they'd sell 'em poisoned grub too, and that would kill 'em. They had fifty barrels of whiskey at massa's, too; they said they'se goin' to call it old rye, and they'se goin' to put strichnine in it and sell it to the soldiers and kill 'em all. They said that would be mighty easy done."

John stated further that it was full two days' travel by water or by wagon to Paducah from where he lived. He had been to that place on one or more occasions with his master.

"Mas'r and missus both want to hang all de Union men," said he.

"They don't like anybody who will say a good word for Lincoln. But they are friends to everybody who is friends to Jeff. Davis."

"They said they'se gwine to vote for s'seshn." (According to their statement they left Tennessee previous to the vote on the 8th inst.)

Anne says that "Union City is nearer to her master's than Paducah, that mas'r went to Union City a week before I cum away. He was thar three days. He can go thar from home in twelve hours. When he goes thar he starts early in the morning, at sunrise, and he goes the other way, only a little more that way," bringing her finger around toward the North. "He thinks, and missus thinks," continued she, "that Linkum out to be burnt to a stake, and they both of 'em say that Jiff. Davis is gone to ole Virginy to beat Linkum's troops with rocks, and that he's just the man to do it. They bet on him." On being asked if she ever heard of Gov. Magoffin, she replied quickly, "I've heard of Gov. Harris; never heard of no Gov. Magoffin."

Their evidence goes to show that they are from Tennessee. If this should prove to be the case, they will in no case be delivered up to any claimant. If, on the contrary, a Union man of Kentucky should set up a claim to them and prove title by the laws of Kentucky, and take the oath of allegiance to the United States government, the policy of the government toward Kentucky is such, that they would probably be permitted to return. For the present they are allowed to busy themselves in taking care of some of the officers' quarters, and seem to enjoy themselves hugely in their new position.

Another of these contraband articles came into the camp of Col. Shuttner this evening to seek protection. What decision will be made of his case has not yet transpired.—*Cor. World.*

VARIOUS FACTS AND INCIDENTS.

BLOCKADING THE PORT OF CHARLESTON.—It has been resolved, so it is said, to blockade Charleston harbor most effectually, and by the same process which the rebels initiated. Vessels loaded with stone will be sunk across the entrance of the port, so as to prevent the egress or ingress of vessels.—*Times.*

AN IMPROVED CATECHISM.—A young miss of our city, whose acquirements are rather beyond her four summers, was a few days since repeating the catechism at her mother's knee. In response to the question, What did God create? she said, "The earth, the sun, the moon, the stars—*and stripes.*"—*Belfast (Me.) Journal.*

IMPORTANT EXPEDITION TO TEXAS.—A naval expedition of much magnitude will soon be fitted out to operate on the Coast of Texas. It will consist of transports, carrying munitions of war and men, conveyed by small vessels-of-war. The former will be large enough to take the field and form a nucleus, around which the Union men, under Houston, can rally. Preparations are now making for the expedition.—*Times.*

A. H. STEPHENS.—*The Herald's* Washington correspondent, writing on the 24th, says: "A report reaches us to-night that Alexander H. Stephens, the Vice-President of the Confederate States, so-called, is dead. The information comes through rebel sources, and hence cannot be traced beyond this point. I believe it is well known that he has recently been quite ill."

THE NATIONAL HYMN.—The Committee on the national hymn announce that the time for the reception of manuscripts by them has expired, and that no more will be admitted to competition. The number already in their hands is *over eleven hundred and fifty*. The public will see at once that the examination and comparison of such a mass of manuscript matter must be a work of some time.

THE DISTRICT HOSPITALS.—The hospitals for the army in Washington have now been fully organized by the War Department. The nursing department of these is under the charge of Miss E. M. Powell, of New York, who has been eminently successful in her mission. She has the disbursement of the fund provided by the New York Chamber of Commerce for invalid soldiers from that city. The government hospital in Georgetown, of which she has charge, has been highly complimented by army officers.—*World.*

MINISTER HARVEY.—Information has been obtained from Charleston which further implicates Minister Harvey. I saw, to-day, a letter from a gentleman formerly resident in Charleston, which clearly establishes the fact that Harvey was the Washington confidential correspondent of the Charleston *Mercury*. The author of this letter saw himself daily the evidence of this fact in the office of *The Mercury*. His information to that paper was continued after his appointment as Minister. I think the seized dispatches are exhibiting evidence of the complicity of many of your first men with the traitors at the South. I think Mr. Lamar, one of your bank officers, is found to have had strong sympathies with the rebels.—*Wash. Cor. Times.*

A PIOUS RESPONSE.—It was some time ago that Gen. McClellan, who is a religious and conscientious man as well as able general, telegraphed to the War Department for leave for his soldiers to apply some boards and other refuse lumber lying about his encampment (and belonging to the government) to the building of a church for the regiments to worship in. A militia general would have taken the lumber for this or any other public purpose, without leave asked. Not so the strictly-bred soldier, McClellan. But when the Secretary was asked by the clerk in what terms he should answer the dispatch, he gave a Caledonian wink, and said: "The Lord's will be done!"—*Tribune.*

W. H. RUSSELL, of the London *Times*, arrived here (Cairo) from the South this afternoon (June 18). He speaks kindly of the hospitality of the South, but complains of their mediesome curiosity as evinced towards him. He says that "they are a very hospitable and a very genteel people, but vastly given to bombast and falsification; that his correspondence has been tampered with, if the London *Times* prints the letters as he has seen them copied in American papers. He is satisfied that many of his letters have been detained in the South, and he thinks nearly all have been opened and read by the Southern officials."—*Cor. Herald.*

NO PREJUDICE AGAINST COLOR.—The Vicksburg *Whig* is in ecstacies over a free negro named Jordan Chavis, who has written a letter to the agent of the Confederate Loan, in which he states that he has long been a resident of the County, and had received a land warrant for services in the war of 1812; but being too old for active service, he now desires to present a horse to a cavalry company, and he also authorizes the agent to draw upon him for $500, to be paid out of his next crop, for the use of the Confederacy. The respectful manner in which the *Whig* speaks of Chav

Miscellaneous Department.

LINES ON A SKELETON.

[The following poem appeared in the London *Morning Chronicle*, about fifty years since—anonymous. A reward of fifty guineas failed to discover the author, and its authorship has never been ascertained. We believe the whole of it is comprised in the five stanzas:]

Behold this ruin! 'Twas a skull
Once of ethereal spirit full;
This narrow cell was life's retreat;
This space was thought's mysterious seat.
What beauteous visions filled this spot;
What dreams of pleasure long forgot!
Nor hope, nor love, nor joy, nor fear,
Has left one trace of record here.

Beneath this mouldering canopy
Once shone the bright and busy eye.
But start not at the dismal void,
Nor sigh for greatness thus destroyed.
If with no lawless fire it gleamed,
But through the dews of kindness beamed,
That eye shall be for ever bright,
When stars and suns are sunk in night.

Within this hollow cavern hung
The ready, swift, and tuneful tongue.
If falsehood's honey it disdained,
And where it could not praise was chained;
If bold in virtue's cause it spoke,
Yet gentle concord never broke;
This silent tongue shall plead for thee
When time unveils eternity.

Say, did these fingers delve the mine,
Or with its envied rubies shine?
To hew the rock or wear the gem,
Can little now avail to them;
But if the page of truth they sought,
Or comfort to the mourner brought,
These hands a richer meed shall claim
Than all that wait on wealth or fame.

Avails it whether bare or shod
These feet the paths of duty trod?
If from the bowers of ease they fled,
To seek affliction's humble shed;
If grandeur's guilty bribe they spurned,
And home to virtue's cot returned;
These feet with angel's wings shall vie,
And tread the palace of the sky.

MRS. MARTINEAU ON PROTECTION.

REJOINDER BY MR. GREELEY.

To the Editor of The National Anti-Slavery Standard.

Sir: In your issue of April 13th, Mrs. Harriet Martineau made a very rude and harsh attack, not merely on the provisions and scope of our new American Tariff, but upon the character and motives of its supporters. She was not content with denouncing "the insane Protective policy," declaring it "suicidal," "tyranny and injustice," "ruinous," etc., etc.; she stigmatized the new Tariff as conceived "in a spirit of cupidity," an "aggression of a particular class," the work of "an oligarchy," the "tyrants of the North," men "hostile to justice and freedom," etc., etc.; and was good enough to tell us that if we did not "reverse" our policy, "all is over with the *reputation* and the prospects of the American People." In some thirty years' experience of political controversy, and with a tolerable familiarity with the Pharisaic conceit of our American Free Traders, I have yet no remembrance of a precedent for this grossness of discourtesy, this rudeness of uncharitable imputation. Can the author be she who in your last issue "declines to reciprocate personalities, which are always a confession of weakness"?

Mr. Editor, you have known me some twenty-five years, during all which I have been a zealous and active supporter of Protection to Home Industry. You know that, during that period, I have had no interest in any manufacture or other pursuit which was profited or to be profited by Protection, otherwise than through the general advancement of our country's well-being. I live, and have lived, by making newspapers, and these are protected by a law of Nature, that renders an imported journal no substitute for or rival to one printed in the reader's own neighborhood. That, in consequence, we have better and cheaper journals than we could have if the home product might be supplanted or undersold by foreign rivalry, as American broadcloths or calicoes may be, I can no more doubt than I can my own existence. That we American publishers are benefited by that policy which draws the producers of metals and cloths from Europe to the neighborhood of our own mines and waterfalls, sends their children to our free Common Schools, and makes both parents and children readers of our journals—as they could scarcely be while our workshops remained in Europe—I am equally certain. But this advantage or benefit, incidentally accruing from Protection, we share with our farmers, our mechanics, and the whole body of our people. The farmer who has a factory established near him, almost always finds the value of his farm enhanced thereby; for, instead of growing Wheat and Indian Corn to be sold in distant markets, he now finds a new and constant demand for Vegetables, Roots, Milk, Wood, etc., that were previously unsalable or of little value. These products pay better and exhaust the soil less than those they supplant; hence our more intelligent and large-minded farmers are mainly Protectionists, and our new Tariff was passed by the votes of at least fifty Members of Congress whose constituents have not—but would be very glad to have—any manufactures worth naming now prosecuted among them.

In my younger days, I took up this subject without prejudice or prepossession, and without a particle of interest or hope of interest to incline me to one side or the other, and calmly sought to learn and know the truth. The conclusions I then deliberately formed have never been shaken. They have guided me through life, and are not likely to desert me in my declining years. They may be entirely mistaken; for, not being a Free Trader, I am conscious of my fallibility; but they are shared by millions of educated and thinking Americans, as honest and unselfish as is Harriet Martineau.

And now to her replication in your last.

1. In my former letter, I reufted her assumption that Protection was dictated or impelled by our Manufacturing Interest, by stating the historical fact that, in the order of time, Protection *preceded* Manufactures in our National policy. Not to uphold struggling or existing manufactories, but to call them into existence, and thus create a near, certain, remunerative market for the products of our farmers, was the aim of our early Protectionists, including Niles, Clay, Jackson, Newton, Tod, etc. Their wisdom herein I do not propose to demonstrate, save incidentally; but is not the simple *fact* a sufficient rebuke to Mrs. Martineau's imputations? Does her rejoinder touch the real issue? It was not that Protection was old, as she seems or wishes to apprehend, but that its origin and its objects were totally different from her representations of them, that I urged upon her attention. Why does she neither support her gross imputation of discreditable motives nor honorably withdraw it?

2. She says that "Mr. Greeley cannot seriously doubt the Morrill Tariff having been read here." I am obliged to say that I *do* doubt *her* having read it when she wrote her former attack on it, some twenty days after its passage; and even now I can only concede to her a knowledge of its provisions at the expense of her candor. For in this last letter she charges us with having adopted the Protective policy "in an aggravated form," as "perpetrating a piece of class legislation such as the most retrograde government in Europe would not venture upon," etc., etc. Surely, if this language has any definite meaning, it implies that our new Morrill Tariff is higher and more Protective than any predecessor or any cotemporary—does it not? Well: the fact is that it is *lower* in the general and lower in its Protective provisions than the *average* of the Tariffs that have been enacted by Congress during the last forty years—lower also, I am confident, than the average of the existing *European* Tariffs. Let me cite, in proof, some of its most characteristic provisions:

Iron is charged by this Tariff $15 per ton on Bar, $12 per ton on Railroad, Pig $6 per ton. These are less than *half* the rates charged by the Tariff of 1828, considerably less than those charged by the Tariff of 1842, and, I am confident, less than the average duties charged and paid on Iron during the last forty years. Yet the Iron interest was more considered than any other that claimed or received Protection under this Tariff.

Forty-five years ago, in reducing the preceding War duties, and adjusting them to a state of peace, Mr. Calhoun proposed a minimum duty on Cotton Fabrics of *six* cents per square yard—and that duty, long maintained, was, as I verily believe, the main support of our Cotton manufacture through subsequent years of general depression and frequent disaster to our manufacturing industry. Mrs. Martineau will not share my conviction that it is by virtue of that duty that we now sell Brown Drills and other substantial Cotton Fabrics in the open ports of China in free and fair competition with those of all other nations, and that the demand for our goods on the other side of the planet, already large, is steadily increasing. The minimum duty on Cotton Fabrics by our new Tariff is *one* cent per square yard—just *one-sixth* the rate fixed by Mr. Calhoun—and the highest impost charged by this Tariff on the most tasteful and costly descriptions of Cotton Fabrics is below Mr. Calhoun's *lowest*. Thirty per cent. was the impost fixed by Mr. Walker's Free Trade Tariff of 1846 on Iron and nearly all manufactures of Cotton and Wool; our new Tariff, being in good part Specific, may average somewhat higher than this on these articles, but not materially, while on the whole list it averages below thirty per cent. I must believe that the screechy objurgations so plentifully showered upon us from Europe have been uttered without other than vague, hearsay knowledge of the provisions of our act. How could Mrs. Martineau descant to us on the perils and immoralities of wholesale smuggling, had she known that our new Tariff is not only lower, but considerably lower, not merely in the average but in its most Protective features, than former Tariffs under which we lived and flourished for years without inciting any but the most casual and insignificant attempts at smuggling? Does she not know that the duties which created the class of British smugglers averaged nearer three hundred than thirty per cent.?

3. Mrs. Martineau emphasizes the fact that they have *tried* Protection in England, and have finally concluded that they can do better without it. I do not dispute the fact, but it is, to me, neither apposite nor conclusive. If a good mother were to say to her, "My child had a go-cart last year, yet made a poor business of walking; this year, it has discarded the go-cart and walks much better," she would hardly consider that experience decisive against the utility of a go-cart in any case. I might not only very well concede that Great Britain has discarded Protection, and does well without it; but I could afford to add that I believe the time will come wherein *we*, too, shall have outgrown the need of it. I know many branches of our own industry which once required Protection, but require it no longer; I know others that once required a duty of forty per cent. to give them a fair chance, but now do very well under a much lower rate. I have no doubt that British manufactures now, mainly, need no Protection, as I am very sure that, if I were a citizen of Liberia or Hayti, I should there advocate higher imposts on most manufactures there struggling for existence than I deem necessary or politic here. I fully believe that the British people understand how to shape their Revenue policy with an enlightened regard to their own interests; and I have a like faith in the capacity of my own countrymen.

4. I propose to grapple with the main proposition of Mrs. Martineau, wherein the Free Trade theory is embodied, and I ask the unprejudiced reader to judge whether I do so fairly and successfully. To be sure that I do not misstate it, I quote it in her own words:

"Stripped of all entanglement and disguises, of detail, of hypothesis, and irrelevant incidents, the case is this. Can the country—yours, or mine, or any other—produce any article to better advantage than it can import it? Of the same quality of article, which is the cheaper in the market? If the home-made article is the cheaper, it needs no protection, for the foreign article cannot present itself in competition. If the domestic article is the dearer, then the duty which raises the price of the foreign commodity is so much out of the consumer's pocket. Whether the consumer is forbidden to buy the foreign article, or is made to pay an enhanced price for the domestic one, by its being brought up to the level of the foreign one, he is taxed for the benefit of an artificial product. The whole body of consumers is, in fact, fined for the supposed benefit of every manufacturer who cannot produce his commodity as cheap as the foreigner," etc., etc.

Here is a fundamental assumption that *no article will ever be imported into any country, unless it can be made elsewhere cheaper and at greater advantage than in that country.* The proof that this is mistaken is so ample that I hardly know where to begin citing it; but here are a few facts: When our War Duties were taken off in 1816, and our infant manufactures generally exposed to the full force of foreign competition, British fabrics were freely advertised in Boston at "pound for pound"—that is, what had cost $4.44 in England was offered for $3.33 in America. And a prominent British statesman soon after declared in Parliament that it had been deemed good policy to make large sacrifices in order to strangle in the cradle the infant manufactures of America, and thus secure our expanding markets to their British rivals. I know that large Iron-masters in Great Britain have run their works, in seasons of depression, at a weekly loss of thousands of pounds, deeming this preferable to stopping them and allowing their workmen to scatter. I know that repeated attempts to establish the manufacture of Porcelain in this country have been foiled, not because we lacked any of the elements of such manufacture, but simply because the electric wires running from the manufactories and warehouses of the Old World through the stores of our importers to those of the country retailers could not be disconnected nor evaded. The dealers in ceramic wares in the remotest backwoods settlements are connected with the European manufacturers by links of interest and credit which defy all attempts to break them.

But, apart from this, there are elements which enter into the question of cost—*real* cost—which Mrs. Martineau has not computed. For instance: the sterile, stony region wherein I was born (Southern New Hampshire) is not half arable, and yields sparingly, at a heavy cost of labor. Two-thirds of that region is adapted only to the production of Wood, which there grows with a luxuriance and rapidity hardly known elsewhere. In my young days, Wood (as fuel) had no commercial value there, being in excess, with little demand for it but in the farmers' own chimneys. The establishment of manufactories at Nashua, Manchester, Lowell, Lawrence, has changed all this, and growing Wood is worth from $1 to $3 per cord, according to its proximity to market. The Wood on many farms is worth more to-day than the farms were forty years ago, though enough has meantime been cut from them to buy them twice over. There are farms whereof the Wood, marketed with little labor, is worth more than all that could be raised on them, by patient, arduous toil, in my boyhood. Other bulky products are there produced and sold, which would have brought nothing in the absence of manufactories close at hand. Now, if we were to admit (which I do not) that the *money price* of the fabrics produced in those factories has been enhanced by Protection, I still insist that their *real cost* has been greatly diminished thereby. In other words, I maintain that it is better for our farmers to pay twelve cents per yard for Sheetings in Cord-wood at $2 per cord above the cost of cutting and hauling, than to buy just as good Sheeting at *ten* cents per yard and have no market at all for their fuel. Why is it that what seems so plain a truth to me is rarely considered *at all* by the Free Traders? You know, Mr. Editor, that I have often urged this view of the case upon their attention: did you ever know one of them even *attempt* to deal with it?

Mrs. Martineau does indeed seem to see that, while our grain was excluded from Great Britain by her Corn-Laws, there might have been some excuse for Protection. But there is a Corn-Law which she did not impose and cannot repeal—the law which requires payment for every mile of transportation of each ton of Produce. For instance: I have seen farmers standing in the streets of Iowa City vainly endeavoring to sell great loads of Indian Corn at the rate of fifteen cents per bushel, when that Corn was worth, in this city, seventy-five cents, and in England, perhaps, a dollar. Why could they not sell it at that miserably inadequate price? Simply because nearly everybody within five hundred miles was a producer of Corn in excess; a large surplus must be exported to a great distance to find a market, and the freight charge ate up nearly all the product. Can you believe, Mr. Editor, that if English Manchester and Birmingham were transported to the middle of those grand prairies, Corn would still go begging there for purchasers at fifteen cents per bushel? You do not—you cannot. No, it would be worth nearer fifty cents than fifteen, and would, at least in the forms of Pork, Beef, etc., be always in demand. Now, suppose the policy which drew the makers of Cloths, Hardware, Leather, Shoes, etc., for the Great West to the soil of that West *did* increase the money price of those fabrics twenty-five per cent. above the present rates, and at the same time raised the average price of Corn from twenty cents to forty per bushel, would the farmers be benefited and enriched by that policy, or oppressed and plundered? Answer, you who have known what it is to have great stacks of Wheat and Corn for sale, yet be utterly unable to pay your taxes!

Mr. Editor, the fact that our cycles of Protection have been periods of more than average prosperity and growth, stands out on the face of our history. I distinctly remember confident predictions that our Protective Tariffs of 1828 and 1842 would dry up our Commerce and Revenue, and compel the Federal government to resort to direct taxation for its support. You know that our Commerce and Industry both prospered, our Revenue increased, and our Public Debt was rapidly diminished, under the influence of those Tariffs. You know that those who vehemently opposed the enactment of those Tariffs, on the ground that, by destroying our Foreign Commerce, they would deprive us of Revenue from Imports, in a few years as vehemently demanded their repeal because they produced *too much* Revenue. But you may not so clearly comprehend that, if ten men are growing Food in Illinois, and ten others are making Metals, Cloth, Hardware, etc., in Europe, and twenty others are employed in trafficking in and conveying the food to those artisans and the fabrics to those farmers, an arrangement which would bring the artisans to the side of the farmers, thereby nearly doubling the number of food-growers and fabricants, would rapidly increase the efficiency, comfort, health, enjoyment, of all concerned. Well, that is just what the Protection hitherto accorded to American Industry has done for Labor; it is what our new Morrill Tariff aims to do, *will* do, if well let alone. I speak confidently because I have looked at the question from both sides, while the Free Traders never seem conscious that it has any side but their own. I have weighed their arguments, their facts; and I think I see wherein they err. They never weighed ours, because they had decided the matter in issue before considering it. I leave the subject with your unprejudiced readers, and confidently await their verdict.

New York, June 17, 1861. HORACE GREELEY.

LIFE'S BATTLE FIELD.

Each has his own one path in life,
A circle small within his ken—
And a small circle, too, perchance—
We cannot all be famous men!
And duties are not truly done
By panting vainly after fame,
Or fretting for the want of chance
To quickly make a brilliant name.

A brilliant name! Too oft is this
The phantom that leads many on,
Until, too late, they wake and find
The time for real endeavor gone!
Better to fill a lowly place,
And labor there with soul and heart,
Than dream ambitiously of wealth
Till time and youthful strength depart.

Do I speak sadly? Truth it is
That in the lowest place of life
A man can act a hero's part,
Amid the daily toil and strife!
Aye, amid hourly din and care,
Even though within the humblest home,
Can shine in virtue great and grand
As ever gilded ancient Rome!

Life's heroism does not need
A spacious or a lofty stage;
Life's greatest deeds are not all writ
Upon the flaming golden page!
Believe me, glorious work is done,
As the world's wheels still onward go,
Which ten-tongued rumor never yet
Hath blasoned, or will ever know.

Self-conquest, self-devotion—these
Are the high gifts which give to all
Who own them that well-tempered mind,
Prepared alike to win or fall—
Prepared, with fitting mien, to meet
The happy good or bitter ill;
Unshaken, whether fate the cup
With nectar or with gall may fill!

Each of these words, in loftier truth,
Is a sure talisman in life,
To guard and strengthen heart and brain
In time of hourly din and strife;
All stations they alike befit—
The peasant's cot or monarch's throne—
To every man a priceless gift
They bring, in self-respect alone!

—*Sharpe's Magazine.*

THE LONDON HERALD OF PEACE AND THE WAR IN AMERICA.

BY WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON.

In order that our readers may see how far it is possible for the well-meaning friends of peace and anti-slavery, in England, to misapprehend the fearful conflict now rending this country asunder, and its bearing upon the cause of civil and religious liberty throughout the world, we (*The Liberator*) copy from The London *Herald of Peace*, of June 1st, an article entitled, "The War in America." It is, in many respects, a very remarkable article; remarkable for its ignorance, suppression, or perversion of facts; remarkable for its confusion of mind in perceiving no difference, in principle or purpose, between the American government and the demoniacal slave oligarchy who are traitorously seeking its overthrow; remarkable for its evasion of the question of civil government, and the obligations to maintain it as against bloody usurpation and merciless oppression; remarkable for its sentimental, untimely and preposterous cry of "peace, peace, when there is no peace"; remarkable for its unwarrantable and wholesale impeachment of the pacific spirit and anti-slavery consistency of American Abolitionists, in this trying crisis; and remarkable for its self-complacency, oracular statement, and *ex cathedrâ* tone generally.

It commences with the assumption, that, as in the war of England with Russia, Americans "not only regarded the conflict with a much more calm and Christian feeling than the great majority of Englishmen did, but they really had formed a far soberer and sounder estimate of the merits of the questions in dispute"; so, on the same principle, Englishmen "are better able to form a clear and correct and Christian judgment of American affairs than the American people themselves." This is plausible, and would be forcible reasoning, if the cases were at all analogous; but they are not. The civilized world yet waits to be intelligently informed as to the justifying causes which led England and France to make war upon Russia—allowing war to be right in any case. It will wait in vain. Unquestionably, Russia was entitled to sympathy and success as against her powerful and ambitious invaders, so far as the justice of her cause was concerned. As between the parties, the American people stood in a better position than either of them to decide upon the relative merits of the controversy; and it is gratifying now to be told, that "what they thought *then*, is becoming more and more what all intelligent Englishmen think now, as to the character and issues of the war with Russia."

But what is this struggle in the United States? It is confined to our own soil, and concerns the life of the republic; it relates to the supremacy of constitutional government, and the exercise of its legitimate functions, as against the basest conspirators and the most desperate oppressors; it is to determine whether the people shall still hold the sovereignty in their own hands, or be under the absolute dominion of an arrogant and fiendish slave oligarchy, to the subversion of all free institutions. It is a struggle between the law-abiding and the lawless—between the democratic idea and the rule of the slave plantation—between all that is left of the spirit of freedom, humanity and progress in the land, and all that is despotic, barbarous and retrogressive. The facts are patent to an intelligent world, so that blindness is criminal, and even an error of judgment almost inexcusable.

We submit that the people of England are more competent to manage their own affairs, and to decide upon any controversy as affecting the stability of their own government, than those of any other nation; and this is as true of Americans as it is of Britons. The American people cannot be enlightened or guided by any transatlantic criticisms as to the time or mode of terminating the present struggle: it so involves everything sacred and precious to them, that they need no foreign opinions to enable them to bring it to a speedy and satisfactory conclusion. They know precisely what is at stake, even though they may still delusively hope to see the old order of things restored, leaving slavery untouched within its present limits. They clearly see that it is all resolved into the question of their right to determine their own laws, elect their own rulers, and shape their own destiny; and that question they are prepared to answer in the affirmative, cost what it may.

The real *animus* of the South is set forth in a recent pamphlet by the Rev. Dr. Smyth, a prominent scholar of South Carolina. "What," he asks, "is the difficulty, and what the remedy? Not in the election of Republican Presidents. No. Not in the non-execution of the Fugitive Slave bill. No. It lies back of all these. It is found in that *Atheistic Red Republican doctrine of the Declaration of Independence. Until that is trampled under foot, there can be no peace.*" And the same despotic spirit is still further exemplified in the language of the Carolinians, as given in a recent letter by Mr. Russell, correspondent of The London *Times*, viz: "If that confounded ship had *sunk with those Pilgrim Fathers on board*, we never should have been driven to these extremities"! And still more specifically and comprehensively is it displayed in the following *diatribe* from The Richmond *Examiner*:

"We have got to hating everything with the prefix *free*; from free negroes, down and up, through the whole catalogue. Free farms, free labor, free society, free will, free thinking, free children, and free schools, all belong to the same brood of damnable *isms*. But *the worst of all these abominations* is the modern system of *free schools*. The New England system of free schools has been the cause and prolific source of the infidelities and treasons that have turned her cities into Sodoms and Gomorrahs, and her land into the common nestling-places of howling bedlamites. We abominate the system, *because the schools are free.*"

So, likewise, it is exhibited in the following declaration of Senator Mason of Virginia, the author of the infamous Fugitive Slave bill:

"Free society has failed; and that which is *not* free must be substituted."

And still further is it unblushingly avowed by the Muscogee (Alabama) *Herald*, as follows:

"*Free* society! We sicken of the name. What is it but a conglomeration of *greasy mechanics, filthy operatives, small-fisted farmers*, and moon-struck theorists? All the Northern States, and especially the New England States, are devoid of society fitted for well-bred gentlemen. The prevailing class one meets with in that of mechanics struggling to be genteel, and small farmers, who do their own drudgery; and yet who are hardly fit for association with a gentleman's body servant. That is your free society!"

Extracts like these, from Southern journals, might be extended indefinitely. They all indicate the object of the present treasonable outbreak—the universal extension of slavery, and the consequent overthrow of all free institutions.

With marked disingenuousness, *The Herald of Peace* reprover says—"First of all, President Lincoln declares war against the South as rebels. To this, Mr. Jefferson Davis responds by authorizing privateers to go and prey upon the commerce of the North," etc. "*First of all*"! As if the President were the aggressor—the criminal cause of all these troubles, by a declaration of war, called for by nothing in his oath of office, or in the exigencies of the government itself! What a perversion and suppression of all the facts in the case! What a disposition, for the sake of peace (?), to confound all moral distinctions, and to lose sight of the tremendous issue involved in this conflict! Mr. Lincoln takes the first step in wrong-doing, and Mr. Davis takes the next! The former sets a pernicious example, and the second imitates it! This is as bad as anything to be found in the London *Times* or Charleston *Mercury*—and a great deal harder to be borne, coming from such a source.

In the first place, it is not true that "President Lincoln has declared war against the South"—any more than that Queen Victoria declared war against Ireland, during the Repeal movement under the guidance of O'Brien and Mitchel. We mean nothing invidious toward that movement by the comparison, but refer to it only for illustration, and on the *argumentum ad hominem* principle. We are not aware that, to prevent the effusion of blood, *The Herald of Peace* urged the propriety and duty of acknowledging the independence of Ireland by the British Crown, or that it remonstrated with Throne or Parliament for suppressing the Repeal movement by force and arms. Nor are we aware that, pacific as may be its spirit and purpose, it has had any controversy with the British government *per se*, or evinced any lack of loyalty to it when threatened by traitors and factionists. Where, then, is its consistency in condemning President Lincoln, and accusing him of declaring war, simply for attempting to maintain the Constitution and enforce the laws, in accordance with his oath of office, against the most desperate band of conspirators that have yet found a place in the pillory of the world? What less could the President have done, without being driven from the Capital, and overturning the government in his flight? As the chosen head of the nation, did not his magnanimity and forbearance closely border upon seeming cowardice and imbecility in his dealings with the traitors? For, before his inauguration, had they not violently withdrawn from the Union, organized a separate and fiercely hostile Confederacy, and, without the shadow of an excuse, committed all sorts of outrages upon the property and authority of the government, and upon the persons and firesides of patriotic citizens, without even a reprimand from President Buchanan? And after his inauguration, did not Mr. Lincoln allow them to seize one fort after another, one arsenal after another, one custom-house after another—everywhere to pull down the national flag, and to substitute their own piratical signal in its place—until not a judicial or governmental officer of any grade was tolerated on their soil—without putting forth even so much as a spirited protest against such conduct? Did he and the loyal portion of the nation not wait, with unparalleled patience, until the capture of Fort Sumter proclaimed the alternative of surrendering everything into the hands of the traitors, or of reëstablishing the lawful authority of the government, recovering its stolen property, and vindicating its dishonored flag, however painful or difficult the task? When before did ever a powerful and constitutional administration exhibit to the world such long-suffering, under such aggravations and insults?

Surely, even the most "ultra" friends of peace might find something to commend in such calmness of spirit and reluctance to resort to forcible measures; but *The Herald of Peace* does not seem to appreciate or even recognize it, but arraigns President Lincoln before impeaching Jefferson Davis!

Once more we assert, that this is neither an offensive nor defensive war, properly speaking, by the government; but a rightful and constitutional attempt, on its part, in the last resort, to suppress a foul conspiracy against its existence, by such force as may be necessary. If *The Herald of Peace* believes in the duty of the British government to maintain itself against tyrannous and treasonable machinations, let it not be shocked that the American government is doing the same thing. It was driven to the wall before it exerted a particle of its strength, even for self-preservation; and nothing can be more unjust than to represent it as actuated by a passionate or vindictive spirit. Its language is neither "wild nor frantic," and all its efforts have been characterized by a desire to subdue the conspiracy with the least possible effusion of blood on either side. Who more calm, reflecting, circumspect, and peacefully inclined—in view of the responsible position he fills—than General Scott?

It may be very convenient for the writer in *The Herald of Peace* to waive the question, "whether the American Union is a confederacy of States, or one homogeneous commonwealth"; but as it involves and determines the rightfulness of the government to exist, it is not thus summarily to be set aside, but decided according to historical verity.

"With the open gospel before us," he says, "we have all the materials necessary to qualify us for the investigation." Indeed! Is this a sure and definite test? The gospel in Russia upholds autocracy; in Italy, papal supremacy; in France, Napoleonocracy; in England, a limited monarchy; in the United States, popular sovereignty. In other words, the gospel is so interpreted and received as to sanction each of these governmental forms, according to the geographical position of the parties. "With the open gospel before" him, does our pacific British censor mean to say, that the English government has not a right to try to sustain itself against such as meditate its overthrow, for a horribly evil purpose, by their perfidious machinations? If not, where is the pertinency of his appeal, or the propriety of its special application to the American government at this perilous crisis?

"Ever since the capture of Fort Sumter," says the writer, "the people seem, almost with one accord, to have said, as respects the Prince of Peace, and all the restraints which his blessed and benignant religion has imposed upon the malignity of human passions, 'Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us.'" If this has any force, it means that the people of this country, in consecrating their lives and property to the maintenance of the government—a government of their own formation and choice, without any hereditary taint—deserve to have these severe imputations cast upon them. The patriotism of 1776, for lofty devotion, heroic intrepidity, religious enthusiasm, and generous self-sacrifice, did not surpass, and scarcely equalled, the present popular demonstration. Its spirit was not more humane, nor its purpose more just, nor its weapons any better. We desire to know, therefore, whether *The Herald of Peace* means to apply the language it has quoted from the psalmist, to the American people, for defending the Constitution and laws which they have adopted for their common security. Will the cause of peace or liberty be advanced by abandoning their principles, stifling their convictions of duty, allowing conspirators and traitors of the worst character to hold the country in abject thraldom, and yielding up without a struggle all that was achieved by their revolutionary fathers?

Quoting one or two violent retaliatory expressions against the Southern rebels by "*Northern* orators and journalists" (but not one of the ten thousand ferocious utterances against the people of the North by *Southern* editors and declaimers!), *The Herald of Peace* assumes that this is the animating spirit of the North, making due allowance for "rhetorical extravagance and bombast." What, then, are the facts? In the so-called Confederate States, and even in the border slave States, thousands of Northern residents have had their property confiscated, been subjected to innumerable indignities, compelled to flee to save their lives, and in some instances horribly lynched, simply because of their unwillingness to fight against their country's flag, or for the avowal of Union sentiments, or in some cases for the sole reason that they were of Northern birth. This terrible persecution is going on continually, and its bloody record is already extended to a fearful length.

On the other hand, not only has no Southern resident or sojourner at the North been outraged in his person or property, but a great many Southerners are sending their families to the North for protection! Is not this the first instance on record where a party at war have sent their women and children to their enemies for safety, conscious that they could do so without hazard or disappointment? This is a practical demonstration of the fact, that there is nothing unkind or revengeful in the general sentiment of the North.

And what has been the behavior of the "invading" army, thus far? *The National Intelligencer* says, the New York Seventh Regiment, of eleven hundred men, was encamped on the beautiful grounds of Mr. Stone, on the borders of the city; and such was the strict regard for propriety observed by the whole corps, that not even a flower was pulled or a fence-rail destroyed by them during the whole time of their stay. The same gentlemanly conduct has distinguished the other regiments quartered in and around Washington, of which the Rhode Island regiment has been particularly named. Does this indicate any disposition on the part of the North to make this "a war which will convert one of the most civilized and Christian nations of the earth into a mere horde of savages, biting and devouring one another"? True, it is more than probable that the most fiendish deeds will be perpetrated by the Southern soldiery; but let the infamy attach to whom it belongs. Here is what the Boston *Herald* says:

"The Rebel Sepoys.—At the time of the retreat at Great Bethel, an effort was made by the Federal troops to care for and bring off the wounded; but the rebels raised the black flag, and fired a terrific volley upon the flag of truce. There is no doubt entertained at Fortress Monroe but that the rebels murdered the wounded on the spot, and the prisoners also, if any were taken, which is probable, as some men are missing."

The government forces will find that they are dealing with men who are thoroughly demonized. But we trust they will not be induced, by any consideration, to imitate such barbarous examples. Rev. Mr. Hepworth, of this city, who has just returned from Washington, in his discourse, last Sunday, said—"The soldiers, taken from the mass of the people, are earnest and thoughtful, and are inspired with feelings of sterling patriotism and with a conviction of the justice of their cause. They are sober and earnest, and are really exposed to fewer temptations than has been supposed. There is not wanting evidence of a thoughtful consideration of their duty, to God as well as to their country." Confirmatory of this testimony is the statement made by a correspondent of the Boston *Journal*, relative to the soldiers under Col. Howard, near Washington: "Col. Howard addressed a few brief but earnest words to the men, in which he indicated his warm sympathy with them, his solicitude that they should be actuated by the highest motives—should have the moral preparation by which best to serve God and their country, whether living or dying. Most of the men seemed greatly moved by the appeals of their Colonel, and some of the 2d Regiment, who were present, I saw in tears."

We cannot but regard it as most extraordinary, that while the South has no justification nor apology whatever for her conduct, the writer in *The Herald of Peace* has no word of censure to bestow upon her, nefarious as it has been throughout, but pours out the full vials of his condemnation upon the North, as though she alone were to be held responsible for the rupture which has taken place! So morbid, indeed, is his state of mind, that the reading of "the solemn words of inspiration," from the old Jewish prophets, preparatory to the delivery of discourses on the war, is regarded by him as a profane travesty—"a vehicle for giving vent to the hot and hissing anathemas of human hate and revenge"!

He is at utter variance with the truth in asserting that "many of the leading anti-slavery orators and journals are plunging into the war spirit with a headlong violence which almost leaves all competitors behind"!—"taking the lead in inflaming the passions of their countrymen, and hounding them on to mutual slaughter"!!—"quitting the high ground of moral influence on which they have hitherto planted their foot, to mingle with the howling multitude who are now clamoring for war"!!!—and "lending their sanction to the plea that the end sacrifices the means—that we may do evil that good may come"!!!—Surely, this accuser is beside himself.—*Liberator.*

ENGLAND AND THE AMERICAN WAR.

In a previous letter we took up the cause of England, so far as her Christian good name was implicated, in the report of her sympathy with a Southern slaveholding *coup d'état*. We pleaded ignorance for her—ignorance fostered by the long inaction and apparent imbecility of the free North. There is great cause to stretch both this plea and our patience when steamer after steamer brings in the news of one after another who have wheeled into the train of secession, or stand in an attitude of suspicion and rebuke toward the North. The London *Anti-Slavery Reporter* out with an article showing small sympathy with the North: Lord Shaftesbury allowing his sympathies for the South to be awakened by her evident proclivities for monarchical institutions: Exeter Hall silent, or gone by the board, when they think they see the United Republic dismembered, and a slaveholding empire rising on its ruins!

Well, as for us, we do not *need* sympathy, and can very well afford to dispense with it; and the universal annoyance and soreness with which these demonstrations have been received, is evidence, not of our sense of the *need* of England, but of the disappointment of that growing esteem and friendship which years of kindly intercourse have established.

Nations, *as such*, are unsentimental affairs, and exhibit the hard, unadorned, horny selfishness of human nature in all their official acts. But the *people* of a nation have a thousand unofficial channels of showing sympathies which outflow the cold hesitancies of national organization. Thus the *government* was cool toward Kossuth, but the *people* were warm; the government was cool toward Italy, but the people were warm; and when a people *are* warm, they always find means of showing it.

The fact is, all the Christians of foreign nations who have stood aghast at the complicity of Northern Christians with slavery, fall into exactly the same net the first time they come into exactly the same position—that is to say, when any of their own pursuits or interests would be injured by opposition to slavery. The French Protestants were ready, with national vivacity, to tear their hair over the disgrace to a mutual Protestantism occasioned by the silence of American religious bodies on the subject of slavery, and rested not till they had sent over a remonstrance, signed by all the Protestant pastors in France and Switzerland, to the pastors in America. Our pastors were conjured, with right martial French energy, to awake, and not to give place to such a sin and shame—no, not for an hour!—to cry aloud and spare not—to show to the house of Judah their sin, and so on.

At the heels of this trumpet came Dr. Monod to America to solicit material aid for these very Churches; and Dr. Monod immediately made the discovery that the policy of the Tract Society in keeping silence on slavery was eminently wise and Christian.

England has poured in remonstrance after remonstrance upon America in every way, shape, and form—always well-meaning, often wanting in tact of expression, but showing, as we Americans well believed, the stout heart of oak of old Clarkson and Wilberforce—and so, though it galled us, we said, "Faithful are the wounds of a friend."

But now the cotton crop is touched, and what is Exeter Hall and *The Anti-Slavery Reporter* about to do? What are they doing? We have heard reports—we hear every steamer—and as yet have heard no cheers along the lines for the free men of the North—and low mutterings and half-suppressed sympathies with the men who have driven down their flag-staff through the heart of the slave. The platform the Southern Confederacy stands on is the neck of the negro—and seeing them standing there, England begins, earliest of nations, to raise the question of acknowledgment, and Exeter Hall looks on without a cheer for the free States.

We mean to verify our words when we say that the flag-staff of the Southern Confederacy is planted through the heart of the slave. They have published their *status* to the world in language the most salient and unmistakable.

Let us quote the language of Vice-President Stephens in February, 1861, in a labored attempt to show to mankind the character and motives of the seceding Confederacy:

"Though last, not least, the new Constitution has put at rest for ever all the agitating questions relating to our peculiar institutions—*African slavery* as it exists among us, the proper *status* of the negro in our form of civilization. *This was the immediate cause of the late rupture, and of the present revolution.* Jefferson, in his forecast, had anticipated this as the rock upon which the old Union would split. He was right. What was conjecture with him is now a realized fact. But whether he fully comprehended the great truth upon which that rock stood, and stands, may be doubted. The prevailing ideas entertained by him and most of the leading statesmen at the time of the formation of the old Constitution, were that the enslavement of the African race was in violation of the laws of nature: that it was wrong in principle, socially, morally, and politically. It was an evil they knew not well how to deal with; but the general opinion of the men of that day was, that somehow or other, in the order of Providence, the institution would be evanescent, and pass away. * * * * *Those ideas, however, were fundamentally wrong. They rested upon the assumption of the equality of races. This was an error. It was a sandy foundation, and the idea of a government built upon it, when the storm came, and wind blew, it fell.*

"Our new government is founded upon *exactly the opposite ideas; its foundations are laid, its corner-stone rests, on the great truth that the negro is* NOT *equal to the white man*; that slavery, subordination to the superior race, is his natural and normal condition. This *our new government is the* FIRST *in the history of the world based upon this* great physical, philosophical, and moral truth.

* * * * * * * * * *

"The negro by nature or the curse of Canaan is fitted for the condition which he occupies in our system. The architect, in the construction of a building, lays the foundation with the proper material—the granite—then comes the brick or the marble. The substratum of our society is made of the material by nature best fitted for it, and by experience we know it is best not only for the superior but the inferior race that it should be so. It is indeed in conformity with the Creator. It is not for us to inquire into the wisdom of his ordinances or to question them. * * * *

"The great objects of humanity are best attained when conformed to his laws and degrees in the formation of governments as well as in all things else. Our Confederacy is founded on principles in strict conformity with these laws. This stone which was rejected by the builders is become the chief stone of the corner of our new edifice."

This language is plain enough. He who runs may read.

Here, then, is their new Jerusalem, with its negro granite foundation; and the right to hold slaves, that stone rejected of the North, is the chief corner-stone.

"It has been apprehended by some," continues Mr. Stephens, "that we shall have arrayed against us the whole civilized world." And, truly, considering the abolition meetings and anti-slavery protests poured in from England for the last fifty years, they had a right to suppose *one* nation, at least, would raise a simultaneous shout of horror and reprobation when this black flag of slavery was raised to mast-head as a distinctively national banner.

Place two facts in juxtaposition, and let the world look at them:

The Confederate States the first political union built on negro slavery—England the first state to ra